AD-A089 589 WISCONSIN UNIV-MADISON MATHEMATICS RESEARCH CENTER F/G 12/1
LOCAL PIECEWISE POLYNOMIAL PROJECTION METHODS FOR AN ODE WHICH --ETC(U)
MAY 80 C DE BOOR, B SWARTZ DAAG-80-C-0041
UNCLASSIFIED MRC-TSR-2072 NL

1 OF 1
AD A
089589

END
DATE
FILMED
10-80
DTIC

AD A089589

MRC Technical Summary Report #2072

LOCAL PIECEWISE POLYNOMIAL PROJECTION METHODS FOR AN ODE WHICH GIVE HIGH-ORDER CONVERGENCE AT KNOTS

Carl de Boor and Blair Swartz

LEVEL II

Mathematics Research Center
University of Wisconsin—Madison
610 Walnut Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

May 1980

(Received April 9, 1980)

Approved for public release
Distribution unlimited

Sponsored by

U. S. Army Research Office
P. O. Box 12211
Research Triangle Park
North Carolina 27709

U. S. Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20545

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER 2072	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A089 589	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) LOCAL PIECEWISE POLYNOMIAL PROJECTION METHODS FOR AN ODE WHICH GIVE HIGH-ORDER CONVERGENCE AT KNOTS		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Summary Report - no specific reporting period 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Carl de Boor and Blair Swartz		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) W-7405-Eng.36 DAAG29-75-C-0024 DAAG29-80-C-0041
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Mathematics Research Center, University of Wisconsin 610 Walnut Street Madison, Wisconsin 53706		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Work Unit Number 3 - Numerical Analysis
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS (See Item 18 below)		12. REPORT DATE May 1980 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 17
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

U. S. Army Research Office
P. O. Box 12211
Research Triangle Park
North Carolina 27709

U. S. Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20545

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

piecewise polynomial, projection methods, ordinary differential equations, boundary value problems, eigenvalue problems, superconvergence, ssuper projectors

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Local projection methods which yield $C^{(m-1)}$ piecewise polynomials of order $m+k$ as approximate solutions of a boundary value problem for an m^{th} order ordinary differential equation are determined by the k linear functionals at which the residual error in each partition interval is required to vanish. We develop a condition on these k functionals which implies

(continued)

DD FORM 1473, 1 JAN 73 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

ABSTRACT (continued)

breakpoint superconvergence (of derivatives of order less than m) for the approximating piecewise polynomials. The same order of super-convergence is associated with eigenvalue problems. A discrete connection between two particular projections yielding $O(|\Delta|^{2k})$ superconvergence, namely (a) collocation at the k Gauss-Legendre points in each partition interval and (b) "essential least-squares" (i.e., local moment methods), is made by asking that this same order of superconvergence result when using collocation at $k-r$ points per interval and simultaneous local orthogonality of the residual to polynomials of order r; the $k-r$ points then necessarily form a subset of the k Gauss-Legendre points.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - MADISON
MATHEMATICS RESEARCH CENTER

LOCAL PIECEWISE POLYNOMIAL PROJECTION METHODS FOR AN ODE WHICH GIVE HIGH-ORDER CONVERGENCE AT KNOTS

Carl de Boor and Blair Swartz

Technical Summary Report #2072
May 1980

ABSTRACT

Local projection methods which yield $C^{(m-1)}$ piecewise polynomials of order $m+k$ as approximate solutions of a boundary value problem for an m^{th} order ordinary differential equation are determined by the k linear functionals at which the residual error in each partition interval is required to vanish. We develop a condition on these k functionals which implies breakpoint superconvergence (of derivatives of order less than m) for the approximating piecewise polynomials. The same order of super-convergence is associated with eigenvalue problems. A discrete connection between two particular projectors yielding $O(|\Delta|^{2k})$ superconvergence, namely (a) collocation at the k Gauss-Legendre points in each partition interval and (b) "essential least-squares" (i.e., local moment methods), is made by asking that this same order of superconvergence result when using collocation at $k-r$ points per interval and simultaneous local orthogonality of the residual to polynomials of order r; the $k-r$ points then necessarily form a subset of the k Gauss-Legendre points.

AMS (MOS) Subject Classification: 65L15, 65J05

Key Words: piecewise polynomial, projection methods, ordinary differential equations, boundary value problems, eigenvalue problems, superconvergence, ssuper projectors

Work Unit Number 3 (Numerical Analysis)

Suggested running head: Ssuper projectors

Sponsored by the United States Army under Contract Nos. DAAG29-75-C-0024 and DAAG29-80-C-0041 and by the United States Department of Energy under Contract No. W-7405-Eng.36.

SIGNIFICANCE AND EXPLANATION

In piecewise polynomial collocation, one approximates the solution of an ordinary differential equation (ODE) by the piecewise polynomial function (on a given subdivision of the interval of interest and of a given degree) which satisfies the ODE at a certain set of points, the collocation points (and satisfies the side conditions). In 1971, the authors discovered that a careful placing of the collocation points (viz. the choice of the appropriate Gauss-Legendre points, familiar from Gauss quadrature, in each interval of the subdivision) would achieve an unusually high order of convergence at the break-points of the chosen subdivision. This phenomenon, which was subsequently dubbed (by Douglas and Dupont) "superconvergence", has contributed much to the present popularity of collocation methods.

In this report, the authors show that such superconvergence is not a special feature of collocation alone, but can be achieved by a whole class of local piecewise polynomial approximation methods, with collocation at Gauss points at one extreme and "essential least squares" at the other. In this latter method, the residual error is not made to vanish at certain points (as in collocation), but is made to be orthogonal to a space of piecewise polynomial functions (of appropriate degree) on the same subdivision.

As part of the discussion, the authors provide an argument which, so they hope, gives more insight into collocation at Gauss points than the original one.

The responsibility for the wording and views expressed in this descriptive summary lies with MRC, and not with the authors of this report.

LOCAL PIECEWISE POLYNOMIAL PROJECTION METHODS FOR AN ODE
WHICH GIVE HIGH-ORDER CONVERGENCE AT KNOTS

Carl de Boor and Blair Swartz

Introduction. This is the last in a triple (see [2], [3]) of papers concerned with high-order approximation to eigenvalues of an ODE using collocation at Gauss points. Correspondingly, its two sections are labelled 9 and 10 , but it can be read without reference to [3], i.e., to Sections 5 - 8 . Items labelled x.y or (x.y) are to be found in Section x, e.g., in [2] in case x is less than 5 .

When writing [2], we were forced to go through the arguments in [1] once again and ended up improving upon them somewhat (see the proof of Theorem 9.2 below). In the process, we considered more general local piecewise polynomial projection methods in an effort to discover just what produces the superconvergence at breakpoints in Gauss-point collocation. This led us to a simple set of conditions on the local projector used which, so we found, had been formulated much earlier by Pruess [4] in another context. In addition to updating our earlier results in [1] and [2] to cover this wider class of projection methods, we give a detailed analysis of these special local projectors and establish a simple link between the two best known among these, viz. Interpolation at Gauss points and Least-squares approximation.

9. Some projectors which yield superconvergence. As de Boor and Swartz [1] describe it, local projection methods which involve sufficiently rough piecewise polynomials are basically determined by a bounded linear projector Q which carries $C[-1,1]$ onto $\mathbb{P}_k$ (polynomials of **order** k , i.e., of degree $< k$), hence satisfies

(1) $$\|f - Qf\| \le \text{const}_Q \|D^k f\|_\infty \ , \quad \text{all} \quad f \in C^{(k)}[-1,1]$$

for some constant const_Q . Then, given a partition $\Delta := (t_i)_0^\ell$ of $[0,1]$ with

$$0 = t_0 < \dots < t_\ell = 1, \quad |\Delta| := \max_i \Delta t_i \ ,$$

Q determines a map Q_Δ projecting $\times_{i=1}^{\ell} C[t_{i-1},t_i] =: C_\Delta$ onto $\mathbb{P}_{k,\Delta}$ (the space of

Sponsored by the United States Army under Contract Nos. DAAG29-75-C-0024 and DAAG29-80-C-0041 and by the United States Department of Energy under Contract No. W-7405-Eng.36.

piecewise polynomials of order k with breakpoints in Δ) by translating the procedure for $C[-1,1]$ to each partition interval; i.e., by requiring that, on each $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$ and for $y \in C_\Delta$,

(2) $$Q_\Delta y = S_i^{-1} Q S_i y\ , \quad \text{with} \quad (S_i g)(s) := g(t_{i+1/2} + s\Delta t_i/2) \quad \text{for} \quad s \in [-1,1] \quad .$$

Then, from (1),

(1_Δ) $$\|f - Q_\Delta f\|_{(i)} \leq \text{const}_Q |\Delta t_i|^k \|D^k f\|_{(i)}$$

with

$$\|g\|_{(i)} := \sup \{|g(t)| : t_i \leq x \leq t_{i+1}\} \quad .$$

Finally, the projection method for the m-th order differential equation $Mx = y$, $\underline{\underline{\beta}} x = 0$ is determined by requiring that $x_\Delta \in \mathbf{P}^m_{m+k,\Delta} := \mathbf{P}_{m+k,\Delta} \cap C^{(m-1)}[0,1]$ satisfy

(3) $$Q_\Delta M x_\Delta = Q_\Delta y, \quad \underline{\underline{\beta}} x_\Delta = 0 \quad .$$

We consider a set of constraints upon Q which permits proof of $\mathcal{O}(|\Delta|^{k+n})$ breakpoint superconvergence for this projection method. These constraints, constructed by Pruess in another context [4, pp.553-4, esp. p.554, line 5], can be stated as follows:

For some positive integer $n \leq k$ *(and in terms of* $\mathbf{L}_2[-1,1]$ *)*,

(4) $$\mathbf{P}_i \perp (1-Q)[\mathbf{P}_{k+n+1-i}] \ , \quad i=1,\ldots,n.$$

This condition is equivalent to the following: For some sequence $(f_i)_1^{k+n}$ with

(5a) $$\mathbf{P}_j = \text{span}\, (f_i)_1^j \ , \quad \text{all } j,$$

we have

(5b) $$Qf_j = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad j>k$$

and

(5c) $$\int_{-1}^{1} f_i f_j = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad i \leq k < j \leq k+n+1-i \quad .$$

Indeed, by (5a), (4) is equivalent to having

$$\int f_r (1-Q) f_j = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad r \leq i \ , \quad j \leq k+n+1-i \quad \text{and} \quad i=1,\ldots,n \quad .$$

In fact, since $(1-Q)f_j = 0$ for $j \leq k$, (4) is equivalent to having

$$\int f_r (1-Q) f_j = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad r \leq i, \quad k < j \leq k+n+1-i \quad \text{and} \quad i \ ,\ldots,n \ ,$$

i.e., for $j > k$ and $r \leq k+n+1-j$, and so, by (5b), (4) is equivalent to (5c). This shows that (5a-c) implies (4). On the other hand, for any linear projector Q onto $\mathbb{P}_k$, we can find $(f_i)_1^{k+n}$ satisfying (5a-b) by taking

$$f_i := \begin{cases} g_i &, \ i \leq k \\ (1-Q)g_i &, \ i > k \end{cases} \qquad \text{with } (g_i) \text{ s.t. } \mathbb{P}_j = \operatorname{span}(g_i)_1^j, \text{ all } j ,$$

hence the argument also shows that (4) implies (5a-c). Finally, this last statement shows (with $g_i(t) = t^{i-1}$, all i) that (4) is also equivalent to

(6) $$\int_{-1}^{1} t^r (1-Q)t^s = 0 \quad \text{for } r < n, \ r+s < k+n .$$

Since Pruess was the first to consider projectors satisfying (4) (or (6), see [5]), we call any linear projector Q onto $\mathbb{P}_k$ and satisfying (4) a **ssuper projector of order (k,n).**

Example 1. Collocation Taking, in particular, $f_i(t) = \prod_{j<i}(t-\rho_j)$, with $\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_k$ the collocation pattern and $\rho_{k+1}, \ldots, \rho_{k+n}$ arbitrary, we find, from (5), the condition

$$\int_{-1}^{1} p(t) \prod_{j=1}^{k} (t-\rho_j)\, dt = 0 \quad \text{for all } p \in \mathbb{P}_n$$

(used in [1]) to imply that Q, given by polynomial interpolation at $\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_k$, is a ssuper projector of order (k,n).

Example 2. Essential least squares (method of moments, or of iterated integrals) Taking, in particular, $f_i = P_{i-1}$:= the Legendre polynomial of degree $i-1$, all i, we find that Q, given as Least squares approximation from $\mathbb{P}_k$, is a ssuper projector, of order (k,k). We have called the corresponding process "<u>essential</u> least squares" because the associated projection method (3) requires that the residual error, $Mx_\Delta - y$, be orthogonal to $\mathbb{P}_{k,\Delta} = D^m[\mathbb{P}^m_{m+k,\Delta} \cap \ker \underline{\beta}\,]$ (assuming $\underline{\beta} = (\beta_i)_1^m$ to be linearly independent on $\mathbb{P}_m$); while ordinary least squares asks that this residual be orthogonal to $M[\mathbb{P}^m_{m+k,\Delta} \cap \ker \underline{\beta}\,]$. This process has also been called a "local moment method" for an m^{th} order equation. In this connection, recall that Wittenbrink [6;Ex.3c] shows this to be equivalent to asking that the iterated integrals of order j, $1 \leq j \leq k$, of the residual error vanish at all the breakpoints. We have chosen, however, to emphasize its connection to least squares.

The validity of (4) suffices for proof of the following result from which we shall conclude $\mathcal{O}(|\Delta|^{k+n})$ breakpoint superconvergence. The lemma (and its proof) are a variant of Pruess' result [4; section 3] and [5; Lemma 2].

Lemma 9.1 Let Q be a ssuper projector of order (k,n). Then

(7) $$\left| \int_{-1}^{1} f(1-Q)g \right| \le \text{const}_Q \sum_{j\le n} \|D^j f\| \|D^{k+n-j} g\| .$$

Proof. Let $(T_j f)(t) := \Sigma_{i<j} D^i f(0)\, t^i/i!$. Then

$$\int_{-1}^{1} f(1-Q)g = \int_{-1}^{1} f(1-Q)T_{k+n} g + \mathcal{O}(\|f\| \|D^{k+n} g\|) ,$$

while

$$\int_{-1}^{1} f(1-Q)T_{k+n} g = \sum_{r=k}^{k+n-1} D^r g(0)/r! \int_{-1}^{1} f(t)(1-Q)t^r ,$$

since Q reproduces $\mathbb{P}_k$. On the other hand, since Q is a ssuper projector of order (k,n),

$$\int_{-1}^{1} (T_{k+n-r} f)(1-Q)t^r = 0$$

(using (6)), and so

$$\int_{-1}^{1} f(1-Q)t^r = \int_{-1}^{1} (f - T_{k+n-r} f)(1-Q)t^r = \mathcal{O}\left(\|D^{k+n-r} f\|\right) .$$

Consequently,

$$\int_{-1}^{1} f(1-Q)g = \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{r=k}^{k+n} \|D^r g\| \|D^{k+n-r} f\| \right)$$

and the substitution $j := k+n-r$ brings this into the form (7). |||

With the definition (2) of Q_Δ, it follows that

$$\left| \int_0^1 f(1-Q_\Delta)g \right| = \left| \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} (\Delta t_i/2) \int_{-1}^{1} (S_i f)(1-Q)(S_i g) \right|$$
$$\le \text{const}_Q \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} (\Delta t_i/2) \sum_{j\le n} \|D^j S_i f\| \|D^{k+n-j} S_i g\|$$

while, e.g.,

$$\|D^j S_i f\| = (\Delta t_i/2)^j \|D^j f\|_{(i)} .$$

Consequently, we have

Corollary 1 <u>If</u> Q <u>is a ssuper projector of order</u> (k,n)<u>, then there exists</u> const <u>so that for</u> $f \in \times_0^{\ell-1} L_\infty^{(n)}[t_i,t_{i+1}]$ <u>and</u> $g \in \times_0^{\ell-1} L_\infty^{(k+n)}[t_i,t_{i+1}]$,

$$\left|\int_0^1 f(1-Q_\Delta)g\right| \leq \text{const} \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} (\Delta t_i)^{1+k+n} \|f\|_{n,(i)} \|g\|_{k+n,(i)}$$

<u>with</u>

$$\|f\|_{r,(i)} := \max_{j<r} \|D^j f\|_{(i)} .$$

If now f and/or g in Lemma 9.1 are not as smooth as required, say, $f \in L_\infty^{(n_f)}$, $g \in L_\infty^{(k+n_g)}$, with $n_f, n_g \leq n$, then we are only entitled to consider $T_{k+n_g} g$ and $T_j f$ for $j \leq n_f$, hence, instead of (7), we get

$$\text{(8)} \qquad \left|\int_{-1}^1 f(1-Q)g\right| \leq \text{const}_Q \sum_{j\leq n_f} \|D^j f\| \|D^{k+(n_g-j)_+} g\| .$$

Correspondingly, we get

Corollary 2 <u>If</u> Q <u>is a ssuper projector of order</u> (k,n)<u>, then there exists</u> const <u>so that for</u> $f \in \times_0^{\ell-1} L_\infty^{(n_{f,i})}[t_i,t_{i+1}]$ <u>and</u> $g \in \times_0^{\ell-1} L_\infty^{(k+n_{g,i})}[t_i,t_{i+1}]$ <u>with</u> $n_{f,i}, n_{g,i} \leq n$ <u>,</u> <u>all</u> i,

$$\text{(9)} \qquad \left|\int_0^1 f(1-Q_\Delta)g\right| \leq \text{const} \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} (\Delta t_i)^{1+k+\min\{n_{f,i},n_{g,i}\}} \|f\|_{n_{f,i},(i)} \|g\|_{k+n_{g,i},(i)} .$$

We now sketch proofs concerning the convergence of x_Δ satisfying (3) to x . From the proof of Theorem 3.1 in de Boor and Swartz [1], we find that x_Δ exists uniquely for $|\Delta|$ sufficiently small; that if $Mx \in C_\Delta[0,1]$, then

$$\|D^r(x-x_\Delta)\|_\infty \leq \text{const } \omega_\Delta(Mx), \quad 0 \leq r \leq m ,$$

with $\omega_\Delta(f) := \sup_i \sup\{|f(t)-f(s)| : t_i<s,t<t_{i+1}\}$; and that if $x \in C^{(m-1)}[0,1] \cap C_\Delta^{(m+k)}[0,1]$, then

$$\|D^r(x-x_\Delta)\|_\infty \leq \text{const } |\Delta|^k \|x\|_{m+k,\Delta}, \; 0\leq r\leq m \; ; \; \|x\|_{j,\Delta} := \max_i \|x\|_{j,(i)} .$$

The proof of Lemma 4.1 in that paper, which uses this convergence of $x_\Delta =: Rx$ together with the Markov inequality for polynomials, yields additionally that

$$\|x_\Delta\|_{r,(i)} \leq \text{const } \left(|\Delta|/\Delta t_i\right)^k \|x\|_{m+k,\Delta}, \quad r > 0 .$$

The proof of superconvergence then goes as follows: for fixed $s \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$ and for fixed $r < m$,

$$D^r(x - x_\Delta)(s) = \int_0^1 v(t)[M(x - x_\Delta)(t)]\, dt , \text{ where}$$

$$v(t) := (\partial^r G/\partial s^r)(s,t) \in \mathbf{L}_\infty^{(m-1-r)}[0,1] \cap \left(C^{(n)}[0,s]\times C^{(n)}[s,1]\right),$$

$G :=$ Green's function for M under suitable homogeneous side conditions $\underline{\underline{\beta}}$.

Since

$$M(x-x_\Delta) = (1-Q_\Delta)Mx + Q_\Delta M(x-x_\Delta) + (Q_\Delta-1)Mx_\Delta$$

with the second term vanishing by (3), the corollaries to Lemma 9.1 yield (uniformly in s)

$$|D^r(x-x_\Delta)(s)| \leq \text{const } \left[\Sigma_{i=0}^{\ell-1}(\Delta t_i)^{k+1+n(i)} \|v\|_{n(i),(i)}\left(\|Mx\|_{k+n,(i)}+\|Mx_\Delta\|_{k+n,(i)}\right)\right],$$

where

$$n(i) := \begin{cases} \min\{m-1-r,\ n\} & \text{if } s \in (t_i, t_{i+1}) \\ n & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} .$$

Thus we conclude the superconvergence rates of the following theorem which generalizes the collocation conclusions of [1; Thm.4.1]:

Theorem 9.2 Let Q be a ssuper projector of order (k,n). Then, for sufficiently small $|\Delta|$, there exists $x_\Delta \in \mathbf{P}_{m+k,\Delta}^m$ satisfying (3), hence then the linear projector P_Δ given by the rule

(9) $$Q_\Delta P_\Delta f = Q_\Delta f, \quad P_\Delta f \in \{Mz : z \in \mathbf{P}_{m+k,\Delta}^m,\ \underline{\underline{\beta}} z = 0\}$$

is well defined. Further, consider $x_\Delta \in \mathbf{P}_{m+k,\Delta}^m$ satisfying (3) as an approximate solution to $Mx = y$, $\underline{\underline{\beta}}x = 0$, where the coefficients of M lie in $C^{(n+k)}[0,1]$ and the side conditions $\underline{\underline{\beta}}$ are suitable. Then, uniformly in the maximum mesh size $|\Delta|$, we have the global estimates

$$\|D^r(x-x_\Delta)\|_\infty \leq \text{const } \omega_\Delta(y), \quad 0 \leq r \leq m ;$$

$$\|D^r(x-x_\Delta)\|_\infty \leq \text{const } |\Delta|^{k+\min\{m-r,n\}} \|x\|_{m+k+\min\{m-r,n\},\Delta}, \quad 0 \leq r \leq m ;$$

while, uniformly also over the breakpoints $(t_i)_0^\ell$ of Δ,

$$|D^r(x - x_\Delta)(t_i)| \leq \text{const}\ |\Delta|^{k+n} \|x\|_{m+k+n,\Delta}, \quad 0 \leq r \leq m .$$

Remarks. Isolated solutions in $C^{(m+k+n)}[0,1]$ to nonlinear problems can be handled as in [1; Thm. 3.1], where the question of superconvergence is reduced to the superconvergence associated with a linearized problem (which we have just settled).

We have left open so far the question of when the side conditions $\underline{\underline{\beta}}$ are "suitable". Simply put, the side conditions are "suitable" if Green's function resulting from it allows the earlier argument to be made. If, for example, $\underline{\underline{\beta}}$ consists of multipoint conditions, then one fixes a partition $\Delta_0 = (t_i^{(0)})_0^L$ of [0,1] whose partition points contain all the points involved in $\underline{\underline{\beta}}$, and insists that all partitions Δ under consideration are refinements of Δ_0. Green's function for $(M, \underline{\underline{\beta}})$ then satisfies

$$(10) \qquad (\partial G/\partial s^r)G(s,\cdot) \ \varepsilon \ C_{\Delta_0}^{(n)}[0,s] \times C_{\Delta_0}^{(n)}[s,1] ,$$

and this is enough to complete the argument for x_Δ correspondingly in $\times_{i=1}^{L} \mathbf{P}_{m+k,\Delta}^{m}[t_{i-1}^{(0)}, t_i^{(0)}]$. In fact, it is easy to see now how to handle the more general situation in which we have differential operators of *possibly different* orders on the different intervals given by the partition Δ_0, with appropriate side conditions at the points of Δ_0 tying the pieces together.

Turning now to the eigenvalue problem, Corollary 1 of Lemma 9.1 is the general version promised in [2] of Lemma 3.1 there. It therefore permits the following generalization of Theorem 3.1 there.

Theorem 9.3 Let $T = NM^{-1}$ be the compact map on $\mathbf{L}_p[0,1]$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, associated with the sufficiently smooth operators M, N, and $\underline{\underline{\beta}}$ of (0.2). Let μ be a nonzero eigenvalue of T with corresponding invariant subspace S, and let J be a matrix representation for $T|_S$. Let $T_\Delta = P_\Delta T$, where P_Δ is the projector given by (9) associated with a ssuper projector Q of order (k,n). Then, for all small $|\Delta|$, T_Δ has an invariant subspace S_Δ, and $T_\Delta|_{S_\Delta}$ has a matrix representation J_Δ for which

$$\|J - J_\Delta\| \leq \text{const}\ |\Delta|^{k+n} .$$

10. Ssuper projectors of order (k,k) associated with point evaluations. We now look in more detail at the possible ssuper projectors of order (k,k). To begin with, we only consider their action on $\mathbb{P}_{2k}$, and this we can describe fully by specifying their action on the elements of some basis for $\mathbb{P}_{2k}$. We found it particularly convenient to work with the basis $(P_i)_0^{2k-1}$ consisting of the Legendre polynomials. Then, for any linear projector Q onto $\mathbb{P}_k$,

$$(1)\qquad \begin{aligned} QP_j &= P_j \\ QP_{k+j} &= \sum_{r=1}^{k} a_{jr} P_{k-r} \end{aligned} \qquad j=0,\dots,k-1$$

and <u>different projectors</u> Q <u>correspond to different matrices</u> (a_{ij}). Further, <u>two such projectors agree on</u> $\mathbb{P}_{k+r}$ <u>iff the corresponding matrices agree in rows</u> $0,\dots,r-1$.

Let

$$f_j := \begin{cases} P_{j-1} & , j \le k \\ P_{j-1} - QP_{j-1} & , j > k \end{cases}.$$

Then (f_j) satisfies (9.5a-b), hence, with (9.5c), Q is ssuper of order (k,k) iff

$$\int_{-1}^{1} P_{i-1} \sum_{r=1}^{k} a_{j-k-1,r} P_{k-r} = 0 \quad \text{for } i \le k < j \le 2k+1-i .$$

This holds iff $a_{j-k-1,r} = 0$ for $i-1 = k-r$ and $i \le k < j \le 2k+1-i$, i.e., iff

$$a_{qr} = 0 \quad \text{for } 0 \le q \le r-1 .$$

We have proved

Lemma 10.1 <u>The conditions</u>

$$(2)\qquad Qf_{k+j} = 0 \ \underline{\text{with}}\ f_{k+1} := P_k \ \underline{\text{and}}\ f_{k+j} := P_{k+j-1} - \sum_{r=1}^{j-1} a_{j-1,r} P_{k-r}, \quad j=2,\dots,k,$$

<u>establish a one-to-one correspondence between ssuper projectors</u> Q <u>on</u> $\mathbb{P}_{2k}$ <u>and lower triangular matrices</u> $(a_{ir})_{i,r=1}^{k-1}$.

Of course, any such ssuper projector Q on $\mathbb{P}_{2k}$ can be extended to infinitely many such on $C[-1,1]$; and any such can be obtained in the form QP, with P an arbitrary linear projector on $C[-1,1]$ onto $\mathbb{P}_{2k}$. We choose to ignore this aspect, though, since the property of being ssuper of order (k,k) depends only on the action on $\mathbb{P}_{2k}$.

Lemma 10.1 gives rise to several observations.

The first interesting basis function, viz. f_{k+1}, is simply the k-th Legendre polynomial, P_k. Hence, if we think now of Q as being given by the rule

(3) $$Qf \in \mathbb{P}_k \quad \text{and} \quad q_i^* Qf = q_i^* f \ , \ i=1,\dots,k$$

for suitably chosen linear functionals $q_1^*, \dots, q_k^*$, then we must have

(4) $$q_i^* P_k = 0 \ , \quad i=1,\dots,k \ .$$

Now, in Example 1 (Collocation), we had

$$q_i^* f = f(\rho_i) \ , \quad i=1,\dots,k$$

and so (4) is satisfied (for n = k in Example 1) since then $(\rho_i)_1^k$ is simply the sequence of zeros of P_k. In Example 2 (Least squares),

$$q_i^* f = \int_{-1}^{1} P_{i-1} f \ , \quad i=1,\dots,k \ ,$$

and, again, (4) is satisfied since P_k is orthogonal to $\mathbb{P}_k = \operatorname{span}(P_{i-1})_1^k$. Suppose now that, in an attempt to bridge the gap between these two particular ssuper projectors, we look for ssuper projectors for which <u>some</u> of the interpolation conditions are point evaluations, say

$$q_i^* f = f(\sigma_i) \ , \ i=1,\dots,r$$

for some r. Then we conclude from (4) that $\{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r\}$ <u>must be a subset of</u> $\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_k\}$:= zeros of P_k. This leads us to consider

Example 3. Ssuper projectors using point evaluations Let $(\rho_i)_1^k$ be the zeros of P_k in some order. Then, for r=0,...,k, the conditions

(5) $$Q_r f \in \mathbb{P}_k, \quad f - Q_r f \perp \mathbb{P}_r \ , \quad Q_r f(\rho_i) = f(\rho_i) \quad \text{for } i=r+1,\dots,k$$

define a ssuper projector of order (k,k).

This provides us with a sequence of ssuper projectors of order (k,k), with Q_0, i.e., interpolation at the Gauss-Legendre points, at one end and Q_k, i.e., Least-squares approximation, at the other, and so demonstrates a perhaps surprisingly simple connection between the two.

We now verify Example 3. In order to confirm that (5) defines a linear projector Q_r, we note that the conditions mentioned are equivalent to demanding that

$$Q_r f \in \mathbf{P}_k \ , \quad q_i^* Q_r f = q_i^* f \ , \ i=1,\ldots,k$$

with

(6)
$$q_i^* f = \begin{cases} \int_{-1}^{1} P_{i-1} f \ , & i=1,\ldots,r \\ f(\rho_i) \ , & i=r+1,\ldots,k \end{cases}$$

Thus it suffices to show that the matrix

(7)
$$(q_i^* P_{j-1})_{i,j=1}^{k}$$

is invertible. For this, assume that this matrix maps $\mathbf{a} = (a_i)_1^k$ to $\mathbf{0}$, i.e.,

(8)
$$q_i^* p = 0 \ , \ i=1,\ldots,k \quad \text{with} \quad p := \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_j P_{j-1} \ .$$

Let (w_i) be the weight vector (known to be strictly positive) for the corresponding quadrature rule

$$\int_{-1}^{1} f = \sum_{j=1}^{k} w_j f(\rho_j) \ , \quad \text{all } f \in \mathbf{P}_{2k} \ .$$

Then (6) and (8) imply that

$$0 = \int_{-1}^{1} p P_{i-1} = \sum_{j=1}^{r} w_j \, p(\rho_j) \, P_{i-1}(\rho_j) \ , \quad i=1,\ldots,r$$

which shows that the invertible matrix $(P_{i-1}(\rho_j))_{i,j=1}^{r}$ maps the vector $(w_j p(\rho_j))_1^r$ to $\mathbf{0}$ and consequently p not only vanishes at $\rho_{r+1},\ldots,\rho_k$ (by (6) and (8)) but also $p(\rho_j) = 0$ for $j=1,\ldots,r$. Thus $p = 0$, and so $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{0}$.

Note that the invertibility of (7) just proven implies the invertibility of

(9)
$$(P_{j-1}(\rho_i))_{i,j=r+1}^{k}$$

since $q_i^* P_{j-1} = \int P_{i-1} P_{j-1} = 0$ for $i \leq r < j$.

To verify that Q_r is ssuper (a fact not immediately obvious to us), we now show that Q_r can be obtained from Q_0 by a suitable modification. For this, we need to consider these projectors on $\mathbf{P}_{2k+1}$ (on which the super projectors of order (2,k) form a k(k+1)/2-dimensional hyperplane). Let

$$q_j^{(r)} := \begin{cases} P_{j-1} \ , & j=1,\ldots,k \\ (1-\rho_j)P_{j-1} \ , & j=k+1,\ldots,2k+1 \end{cases}$$

hence

$$f_{k+j}^{[r]} = P_{k+j-1} - \sum_{s=1}^{k} a_{j-1,s}^{[r]} P_{k-s} , \quad j=1,\dots,k+1$$

for some matrix $\left(a_{j-1,s}^{[r]}\right)_{j,s=1}^{k+1,k}$. With this notation, we get, for $r = 0$,

$$f_{k+j}^{[0]}(\rho_i) = 0 , \quad i=1,\dots,k, \quad j=2,\dots,k+1$$

and so

$$\text{(10)} \qquad \begin{bmatrix} a_{11}^{[0]} & & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \\ a_{k1}^{[0]} & \cdots & a_{kk}^{[0]} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} P_{k-1}(\rho_k) & \cdots & P_{k-1}(\rho_1) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ P_{k-k}(\rho_k) & \cdots & P_{k-k}(\rho_1) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} P_{k+1}(\rho_k) & \cdots & P_{k+1}(\rho_1) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ P_{k+k}(\rho_k) & \cdots & P_{k+k}(\rho_1) \end{bmatrix}$$

with $\left(a_{ij}^{[0]}\right)$ a lower triangular matrix (by Lemma 10.1) since Q_0 is ssuper. Now write *(10) in terms of partitioned matrices as*

$$\text{(10)}' \qquad \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & 0 \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} \\ C_{21} & C_{22} \end{bmatrix}$$

with A_{11}, B_{11}, and C_{11} all of order $k-r$. Our intent is to replace A_{22} by 0 and to modify A_{21} correspondingly in such a way that the equality in (10) or (10)' is preserved at least in the first $k-r$ columns. Explicitly,

$$C_{21} = A_{21}B_{11} + A_{22}B_{21} = [A_{21} + A_{22}B_{21}B_{11}^{-1}]B_{11}$$

(and B_{11} is indeed invertible since it is just a permutation of the matrix (9)). Thus

$$\text{(11)} \qquad \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & 0 \\ \tilde{A}_{21} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} \\ C_{21} & \tilde{C}_{22} \end{bmatrix}$$

with

$$\tilde{A}_{21} := A_{21} + A_{22}B_{21}B_{11}^{-1} , \quad \tilde{C}_{22} := \tilde{A}_{21}B_{12} .$$

Now consider the linear projector Q on $\mathbf{P}_{2k+1}$ given by

$$\text{(12)} \qquad Qf_i = \begin{cases} f_i , & i \le k \\ 0 , & i > k \end{cases}$$

with

$$
\text{(13)} \qquad
\begin{aligned}
f_i &:= P_{i-1} && , \ i \leq k \\
f_{k+1} &:= P_k \\
f_{k+i} &:= P_{k+i-1} - \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{i-1,j} P_{k-j} && , \ i > 1
\end{aligned}
\qquad \text{and} \qquad (a_{ij}) := \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & 0 \\ \tilde{A}_{21} & 0 \end{bmatrix} .
$$

Then (a_{ij}) is lower triangular, hence Q is a ssuper projector of order (k,k) by Lemma 10.1 . Further, on comparing (10)-(10)' with (11), we see that, for the linear functionals q_i^* of (6),

$$q_j^* f_{k+i} = f_{k+i}(\rho_j) = 0 \quad \text{for } i=2,\ldots,k+1, \quad j=r+1,\ldots,k \ ,$$

while the fact that the last r columns of (a_{ij}) are zero implies that $f_{k+i} \in \mathbf{P}_r$, $i=2,\ldots,k+1$, i.e., also

$$q_j^* f_{k+i} = 0 \quad \text{for } i=2,\ldots,k+1, \quad j=1,\ldots,r \ .$$

In addition, trivially, $q_j^* f_{k+1} = 0$, all j . We conclude that $\ker Q|_{\mathbf{P}_{2k+1}} = \operatorname{span}(f_{k+j})_1^{k+1}$ is contained in $\cap \ker q_j^*|_{\mathbf{P}_{2k+1}}$ and thus must equal it since both are of dimension $k+1$. This shows that $Q = Q_r$ (on $\mathbf{P}_{2k+1}$), i.e.,

$$
\text{(14)} \qquad \left(a_{ij}^{[r]}\right) = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & 0 \\ A_{21}+A_{22}B_{21}B_{11}^{-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix} .
$$

We have established, in particular, that Q_r is ssuper of order (k,k). In addition, comparing again (10)-(10)' with (11), we see that Q_r agrees with Q_0 on $\operatorname{span}(f_i)_{i=1}^{2k+1-r} = \mathbf{P}_{2k+1-r}$. Thus we couldn't tell Q_1 and Q_0 apart on $\mathbf{P}_{2k}$.

We close our discussion of Example 3 with the following four observations.

(i) <u>For</u> $r \neq s$, Q_r <u>differs from</u> Q_s <u>somewhere on</u> $\mathbf{P}_{2k+2-\max\{r,s\}}$ (while, as just noted, the two agree with Q_0 , hence with each other, on $\mathbf{P}_{2k+1-\max\{r,s\}}$. For proof, apply both sides of (10) to the matrix

$$\left(w_{k+1-i} P_{k-j}(\rho_{k+1-i})\right)_{i,j=1}^{k} .$$

Then, assuming that the Legendre polynomials have all been normalized to

$$1 = \int_{-1}^{1} P_j^2 = \sum w_i P_j^2(\rho_i) ,$$

we find that

(15) $$\left(a_{ij}^{[0]}\right) = \left(\sum_{s=1}^{k} w_s P_{k+i}(\rho_s) P_{k-j}(\rho_s)\right)$$

and, in particular,

(16) $$\begin{aligned} a_{ii}^{[0]} &= \sum_{s=1}^{k} w_s P_{k+i}(\rho_s) P_{k-i}(\rho_s) \\ &= \int_{-1}^{1} P_{k+i} P_{k-i} + \mathrm{const}_k D^{2k}(P_{k+i} P_{k-i}) \neq 0 \end{aligned}$$

This shows with (14) that $\mathrm{rank}\left(a_{ij}^{[r]}\right) = k-r$, all r, and so proves our assertion.

(ii) The agreement of Q_r with Q_0 on $\mathbf{P}_{2k+1-r}$ is not restricted to the particular ssuper projector Q_r . If Q is <u>any</u> ssuper projector of order (k,k) which enforces agreement at k-r points, then, not only must the k-r points all be zeros of P_k , say the points $\rho_{r+1}, \ldots, \rho_k$ (in some suitable ordering), but <u>such</u> Q <u>then necessarily agrees with</u> Q_0 <u>on</u> $\mathbf{P}_{2k+1-r}$. For, by Lemma 10.1, Q satisfies (2) for some lower triangular matrix. The matching of function values at $\rho_{r+1}, \ldots, \rho_k$ then forces the equality

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \\ a_{k-r,1} & \cdots & a_{k-r,k-r} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} P_{k-1}(\rho_k) & \cdots & P_{k-1}(\rho_{r+1}) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ P_{k-r}(\rho_k) & \cdots & P_{k-r}(\rho_{r+1}) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} P_{k+1}(\rho_k) & \cdots & P_{k+1}(\rho_{r+1}) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ P_{2k-r}(\rho_k) & \cdots & P_{2k-r}(\rho_{r+1}) \end{bmatrix} .$$

In the terms of (10)', this reads

$$\left(a_{ij}\right)_{i,j=1}^{k-r} B_{11} = C_{11}$$

and the invertibility of B_{11} used earlier now proves that therefore

$$\left(a_{ij}\right)_{i,j=1}^{k-r} = A_{11} = \left(a_{ij}^{[0]}\right)_{i,j=1}^{k-r} .$$

(iii) The sequence $Q_1, \ldots, Q_{k-1}$ connecting Q_0 to Q_k constructed in Example 3 depends on the particular order $\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_k$ in which we have chosen to write down the k zeros of P_k . <u>If</u> (Q_r') <u>is the sequence corresponding to the ordering</u> $\rho_1', \ldots, \rho_k'$, <u>then</u> $Q_r = Q_r'$ <u>on</u> $\mathbf{P}_{2k+1}$ <u>iff the two sets</u> $\{\rho_{r+1}, \ldots, \rho_k\}$ <u>and</u> $\{\rho_{r+1}', \ldots, \rho_k'\}$ <u>coincide</u>. Indeed, from (14), $Q_r = Q_r'$ on $\mathbf{P}_{2k+1}$ iff

$$A_{21} + A_{22} B_{21} B_{11}^{-1} = A_{21}' + A_{22}' B_{21}' (B_{11}')^{-1} .$$

Now, obviously, $A_{ij} = A_{ij}'$, - (15) makes this quite explicit, but it is clear anyway since Q_0 does not depend on the order in which we write down the interpolation points, - and A_{22} is invertible, e.g., by (16) . Thus, $Q_r' = Q_r$ on $\mathbf{P}_{2k+1}$ iff

$D := B'_{21}(B'_{11})^{-1} - B_{21}B_{11}^{-1} = 0$. Let Π be the permutation matrix for which $B' = B\Pi$. Then, on partitioning Π as B is in (10)', we find

$$B'_{11} = B_{11}\Pi_{11} + B_{12}\Pi_{21} \quad , \quad B'_{21} = B_{21}\Pi_{11} + B_{22}\Pi_{21}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} DB'_{11} &= B'_{21} - B_{21}B_{11}^{-1}B'_{11} \\ &= B_{21}\Pi_{11} + B_{22}\Pi_{21} - B_{21}B_{11}^{-1}(B_{11}\Pi_{11} + B_{12}\Pi_{21}) \\ &= (B_{22} - B_{21}B_{11}^{-1}B_{12})\Pi_{21} \end{aligned}$$

Now note that $B_{22} - B_{21}B_{11}^{-1}B_{12}$ is the lower right diagonal block obtained by block Gauss elimination applied to B , hence is invertible (since B is). We conclude that $D = 0$ iff $\Pi_{21} = 0$, and that says that Π permutes the first $k-r$ columns of B among themselves.

(iv) Finally, we observed earlier that the collection of all ssuper projectors of order (k,k) on $\mathbf{P}_{2k+1}$ forms a linear manifold or hyperplane of dimension $k(k+1)/2$. We now show that this linear manifold is *spanned by the particular ssuper projectors* Q_r introduced here. Precisely, we show that the collection of all ssuper projectors of order (k,k) on $\mathbf{P}_{2k+1}$ is the affine hull of the $1 + k(k+1)/2$ particular projectors

$$Q_0, Q_{11}, \ldots, Q_{1k}, Q_{22}, \ldots, Q_{2k}, Q_{33}, \ldots, Q_{k-1,k}, Q_{kk},$$

with Q_0 collocation at all the zeros $(\rho_i)_1^k$ of P_k , while, for $1 \leq r \leq s \leq k$, Q_{rs} is given by orthogonality to $\mathbf{P}_r$ and matching of function values at the $k-r$ points $\rho_r, \ldots, \rho_{s-1}, \rho_{s+1}, \ldots, \rho_k$. Here, (ρ_i) are in any particular order; in fact, in the definition of Q_{rs} , this order could even change with r (though not with s). To prove the assertion, it is sufficient to show that the $k(k+1)/2$ linear maps $\{Q_{rs}-Q_0 : 1 \leq r \leq s \leq k\}$ are linearly independent (as points in the linear space of all linear maps on $\mathbf{P}_{2k+1}$) and for this, it is sufficient to exhibit points x_{ij} in $\mathbf{P}_{2k+1}$ and linear functionals λ_{ij} on $\mathbf{P}_{2k+1}$ for which

$$\lambda_{ij}(Q_{rs}-Q_0)x_{ij} \neq 0 \quad \text{for } (i,j) = (r,s)$$

$$= 0 \quad \text{for } i > r \text{ , and for } i = r \text{ and } j > s$$

since this insures that the matrix $(\mu_{ij}(Q_{rs}-Q_0)x_{ij})$ is upper triangular with nonzero diagonal entries (using the ordering $11,12,\ldots,1k,22,\ldots,2k,33,\ldots,kk$), hence invertible. (We are using here the standard argument whereby the sequence (y_s) in a linear space is linearly independent iff there exists a corresponding sequence (ν_r) of linear functionals on that space for which the matrix $(\nu_r y_s)$ is invertible.) First, pick $x_{ij} = P_{2k+1-i}$, all i,j. Then, since Q_{rs} forces agreement at $k-r$ points, it agrees, by (ii), with Q_0 on $\mathbf{P}_{2k+1-r}$ and so $\mu_{ij}(Q_{rs}-Q_0)x_{ij} = 0$ for $2k+1-i < 2k+1-r$, i.e., for $i > r$ no matter how we pick μ_{ij}. Further, pick $\mu_{ij}: f \longmapsto f(\rho_j)$, all i,j. Then, as both Q_0 and Q_{rs} match the value at ρ_j when $r \leq j \neq s$, we conclude that $\mu_{ij}(Q_{rs}-Q_0)x_{ij} = 0$ also for $i = r$ and $j > s$ ($>r$). Finally, we claim that $\mu_{ij}(Q_{ij}-Q_0)x_{ij} \neq 0$. For, otherwise, $Q_{ij}P_{2k+1-i}$ would agree with P_{2k+1-i} at $\rho_i, \ldots, \rho_k$ as well as at the linear functionals $f \longmapsto \int P_{r-1}f$, $r=1,\ldots i-1$, i.e., Q_{ij} would agree with $Q_{i-1,i-1}$ at P_{2k+1-i} and this would contradict (i).

Finally, up to this point, this section has been concerned with ssuper projectors of order (k,k). But we think it worth recording a version of Lemma 10.1 for ssuper projectors Q of order (k,n), $1 \leq n \leq k$, along with a corresponding corollary concerning the k linear functionals $(q_i^*)_1^k$ associated with Q.

Lemma 10.2 The conditions

(17) $\qquad Qf_{k+j} = 0$ with $f_{k+j} := P_{k+j-1} - \Sigma_{r=1}^{k-n+j-1} a_{j-1,r}P_{k-r}$, $j=1,\ldots,N$

establish a one-to-one correspondence betwen ssuper projectors Q of order (k,n) on $\mathbf{P}_{k+N}$, $N > n$, and lower trapezoidal matrices

(18) $$(a_{qr})_{q=0}^{N-1}{}_{r=1}^{k}, \text{ with } a_{qr} = 0 \text{ for } k-n+q < r \leq k.$$

In terms of linear functionals $(q_i^*)_1^k$ associated with Q via (3), the ssuper projector criterion (9.4) may be expressed as

$$P_i \; [illegible] \; P_{k+n+1-i} \; [illegible] \; \bigcap_{r=1}^{k} \ker q_r^* \; , \; [illegible] \; 1, \ldots [illegible]$$

and Lemma 10.2 may be restated as

Corollary The linear functionals $q_{i=1}^{*\,k}$ define a [illegible] on $\mathbf{P}_{k+N}$, $N \geq n$, iff the two blocks of the $(k+N)\times k$ matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} B_{k\times k} \\ \hline C_{N\times k} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad b_{ij} := q_j^* P_{k-1-i}, \; 0 \leq i < k \; , \; \text{and} \; [illegible]$$

(whose transpose decribes the action of the functionals [illegible] ..., P_0, P_k, ..., P_{k+N-1}) of $\mathbf{P}_{k+N}$) satisfy

$$CB^{-1} = A \; ,$$

where the matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{i=0}^{N-1}\,{}_{j=1}^{k}$ has the lower trapezoidal [illegible] functionals define distinct ssuper projectors precisely to the extent that the corresponding matrices A are distinct.

Proof. Q is a projector onto $\mathbf{P}_k$ iff B is nonsingular. Q is ssuper of [illegible] (k,n) on $\mathbf{P}_{k+N}$ iff the matrix A of (18) is connected with [illegible] via (17). The [illegible] element of the assertion $C - AB = 0$ is found by applying q_i^* to (17).

REFERENCES

1. C. de Boor and B. Swartz, Collocation at Gaussian points, SIAM J.Numer.Anal. 10(1973) 582-606
2. C. de Boor and B. Swartz, Collocation approximation to eigenvalues of an ordinary differential equation: the principle of the thing, Math.Comp., to appear.
3. C. de Boor and B. Swartz, Collocation approximation to eigenvalues of an ordinary differential equation: Numerical illustrations, Math.Comp., submitted.
4. S.A. Pruess, Solving linear boundary value problems by approximating the coefficients, Math.Comp. 27(1973) 551-561.
5. S.A. Pruess, High order approximation to Sturm-Liouville eigenvalues Numer.Math.24 (1975) 241-247.
6. K.A. Wittenbrink, High order projection methods of moment and collocation type for nonlinear boundary value problems, Computing 11(1973) 255-274.