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# APPROXIMATION OF TWO-VARIATE FUNCTIONS: <br> SINGULAR VALUE DECOMPOSITION VERSUS REGULAR SPARSE GRIDS 
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#### Abstract

We compare the cost complexities of two approximation schemes for functions $f \in H^{p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$ which live on the product domain $\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}$ of general domains $\Omega_{1} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_{1}}$ and $\Omega_{2} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_{2}}$, namely the singular value / Karhunen-Lòeve decomposition and the regular sparse grid representation. Here we assume that suitable finite element methods with associated fixed order $r$ of accuracy are given on the domains $\Omega_{1}$ and $\Omega_{2}$. Then, the sparse grid approximation essentially needs only $\mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon^{-\frac{\max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}{r}}\right)$ unknowns to reach a prescribed accuracy $\varepsilon$ provided that the smoothness of $f$ satisfies $p \geq 2 r$, which is an almost optimal rate. The singular value decomposition produces this rate only if $f$ is analytical since otherwise the decay of the singular values is not fast enough. If $p<2 r$, then the sparse grid approach gives essentially the rate $\mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon^{-\frac{2 \max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}{p}}\right)$ while, for the singular value decomposition, we  shows that, in our setting and if $n_{1}=n_{2}$, the regular sparse grid approach is superior to the singular value decomposition. We prove the resulting complexities, compare the two approaches and give the results of numerical experiments which demonstrate that these rates are also achieved in practice.


## 1. Introduction

The efficient approximate representation of multivariate functions is an important task in numerical analysis and scientific computing. In this paper, we concentrate on functions which live on the product of two domains $\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}$. Already for this simple situation, there exists a large amount of applications: such problems involve for example radiosity models and radiative transfer [30]. Here, $\Omega_{1}$ denotes the spatial threedimensional domain of a geometric object under consideration and $\Omega_{2}$
is the sphere $\mathbb{S}^{2}$. Moreover, in the case of space-time discretizations of parabolic problems, $\Omega_{1}$ is the time interval whereas $\Omega_{2}$ is the spatial domain [14, 29].

Then, there are various phase space problems where both $\Omega_{1}$ and $\Omega_{2}$ are three-dimensional cubes or the full three-dimensional real space. Examples are the Boltzmann equation, kinetic equations or the Langevin equation, see e.g. [1]. Furthermore, non-Newtonian flow can be modeled by a coupled system which consists of the Navier Stokes equation for the flow in a three-dimensional geometry described by $\Omega_{1}$ and of the Fokker-Planck equation in $3(k-1)$-dimensional configuration space on $\Omega_{2}$. Here $k$ denotes the number of atoms in a chain-like molecule which constitutes the non-Newtonian behavior of the flow, for details see [3, 20, 23]. Note that the domain of the configuration space is itself again a product of $k-1$ spheres.

Another example is two-scale homogenization. After unfolding [5], it gives raise to the product of the macroscopic physical domain and the periodic microscopic domain of the cell problem, see [24]. For multiple scales, a general product appears here which still can be written as the product of two domains, one containing e.g. the macroscopic scale and the other consisting of the product of the domains of the different microscales [19].

Also the two-point correlation functions of linear elliptic boundary value problems with stochastic source terms are known to satisfy a deterministic partial differential equation with the tensor product of the elliptic operator on the product of the physical domain [17, 26, 27]. Higher order moments then involve larger tensor products [28]. This approach extends to stochastic diffusion functions and more general PDEs with stochastic coefficient functions as well as to stochastic domains $[16,18]$.

Finally we find the product of two domains in quantum mechanics for e.g. the Schrödinger equation for Helium; systems with more than two electrons involve then multiple product domains, of course.

In general, some problems are directly given on the product of two domains, while for other problems the domains themselves are products of lower-dimensional domains. Then, the domain of an $n$-dimensional
problem with e.g. $n$ being some power of two can be split into the tensor product of two domains of dimension $n / 2$ which then can be recursively further split until a terminal situation (a one-dimensional domain or a truly higher dimensional but non-tensor product domain) is reached. Related representation methods have recently been considered in [2, 15, 22].

In this article, we consider the simple case of two domains $\Omega_{1}$ and $\Omega_{2}$ only. Here, our analysis covers the situation of the first bisection step in the above mentioned recursion. To this end, for $i=1,2$, let $\Omega_{i}$ denote a domain in $\mathbb{R}^{n_{i}}$ (or alternatively also an $n_{i}$-dimensional manifold in $\left.\mathbb{R}^{n_{i}+1}\right)$. We intend to compare the approximation of functions $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ of two variables on the tensor product domain $\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}$ by either the truncated singular value decomposition

$$
f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \approx \sum_{\ell=1}^{M} \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}} \varphi_{\ell}(\mathbf{x}) \psi_{\ell}(\mathbf{y})
$$

or by regular sparse grids

$$
f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \approx \sum_{j_{1}+j_{2} \leq J} \sum_{k_{1} \in \nabla_{j_{1}}^{(1)}} \sum_{k_{2} \in \nabla_{j_{2}}^{(2)}} \beta_{\left(j_{1}, k_{1}\right),\left(j_{2}, k_{2}\right)} \xi_{j_{1}, k_{1}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) \xi_{j_{2}, k_{2}}^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) .
$$

In the first representation, $\left\{\varphi_{\ell}\right\}_{\ell=1}^{M}$ and $\left\{\psi_{\ell}\right\}_{\ell=1}^{M}$ are sets of orthonormal functions. They are a-priorily unknown and need thus to be approximated by systematic basis functions of some ansatz spaces $V_{J}^{(1)} \subset$ $L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)$ and $V_{J}^{(2)} \subset L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)$, respectively, which is indeed the case in most practical applications. In the second representation, $\left\{\xi_{j, k}^{(i)}\right\}_{k \in \nabla_{j}^{(i), j \leq J}}$ are in general multilevel or wavelet bases of $V_{J}^{(i)}$, where the index $j$ refers to the level of resolution and the index $k$ refers to the locality of the basis function (the precise definition will be given in Section 4).

The result of this paper is as follows: we can proof a rate of the order $\mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon^{-\frac{2 \min \{r, p\} \min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}+2 p \max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}{\left(2 p-\min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}\right) \min \{r, p\}}}\right)$ for the truncated singular value decomposition. For the regular sparse grid method we essentially obtain a rate of the order $\mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon^{-2 \frac{\max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}{\min \{p, 2 r\}}}\right)$ for the degrees of freedom needed to reach a specific prescribed accuracy $\varepsilon$. Here, $p \geq \min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\} / 2$ denotes the Sobolev smoothness of $f$, i.e. $f \in H^{p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$, and $r$ denotes the approximation power of the ansatz spaces $V_{J}^{(1)}$ and $V_{J}^{(2)}$. This shows
(see Section 5) that, already in the simple case of $n_{1}=n_{2}$, the regular sparse grid approach is superior to the singular value decomposition. We prove the resulting cost complexities, compare the two approaches and give the results of numerical experiments which demonstrate that these rates are also achieved in practice.

We remark that in the case of $n_{1} \neq n_{2}$ the regular sparse grid approach can even be improved by the use of an optimized sparse grid (see Remark 4.4 and compare [4] or [11]). Moreover, adaptive approximation offers the possibility of further improvements. The discussion of such more sophisticated approximation schemes is, however, beyond the scope of the present article and will be considered in more detail in a forthcoming paper.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows: In Section 2 we give a short introduction to multilevel approximation. In Section 3 we describe the singular value decomposition of a two-valued function on $\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}$ and discuss its approximation properties in detail. Section 4 gives the basics of the so-called regular sparse grid approximation of a two-valued function on $\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}$ and presents its error rates and cost complexities. In Section 5, we compare the two approximations. In Section 6, we give the results of numerical experiments which show that the theoretical complexity rates are also achieved in practice. Section 7 concludes with some final remarks.

Throughout this paper, the notion "essential" in connection with the complexity estimates means "up to logarithmic terms". Moreover, to avoid the repeated use of generic but unspecified constants, we denote by $C \lesssim D$ that $C$ is bounded by a multiple of $D$ independently of parameters which $C$ and $D$ may depend on. Obviously, $C \gtrsim D$ is defined as $D \lesssim C$, and $C \sim D$ as $C \lesssim D$ and $C \gtrsim D$.

## 2. Approximation on the subdomains

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be a sufficiently smooth, bounded domain. In general one uses finite elements to approximate functions on $L^{2}(\Omega)$. In the present paper we focus on the common $h$-method, i.e., on finite elements of fixed approximation order. Then, particularly for applying multiscale
techniques, one has a sequence of nested trial spaces

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{0} \subset V_{1} \subset V_{2} \subset \cdots \subset L^{2}(\Omega) \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

such that

$$
L^{2}(\Omega)=\overline{\bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{0}} V_{j}}, \quad V_{0}=\bigcap_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{0}} V_{j}
$$

called multiscale analysis. Each space $V_{j}$ is defined by a single scale basis $\Phi_{j}=\left\{\phi_{j, k}\right\}$, i.e., $V_{j}=\operatorname{span}\left\{\phi_{j, k}: k \in \Delta_{j}\right\}$, where $\Delta_{j}$ denotes a suitable index set with cardinality $\#\left(\Delta_{j}\right) \sim 2^{n j}$.

We say that the trial spaces have (approximation) order $r \in \mathbb{N}$ if

$$
\begin{equation*}
r=\sup \left\{s \in \mathbb{R}: \inf _{v_{j} \in V_{j}}\left\|v-v_{j}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{j}^{s}\|v\|_{s} \forall v \in H^{s}(\Omega)\right\} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the quantity $h_{j} \sim 2^{-j}$ corresponds to the mesh width of the mesh associated with the subspace $V_{j}$ on $\Omega$. Note that the integer $r>0$ refers in general to the maximal order of polynomials which are locally contained in $V_{j}$.

Equation (2.2) implies that a given function $v \in H^{s}(\Omega), 0 \leq s \leq r$, can be approximated in $V_{j}$ at a rate $h_{j}^{s}$, that is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\inf _{v_{j} \in V_{j}}\left\|v-v_{j}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{j}^{s}\|v\|_{H^{s}(\Omega)} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, when we approximate a function $v \in H^{s}(\Omega)$ with $0 \leq s \leq r$ by uniform mesh refinement we obtain the rate $h_{j}^{s}$ according to (2.3). Since the meshsize and the number of unknowns in $V_{j}$ are related by $\operatorname{dim}\left(V_{j}\right) \sim 2^{j n} \sim h_{j}^{-n}$, we deduce that

$$
\begin{equation*}
N \sim \varepsilon^{-s / n} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

unknowns have to be spent to achieve an approximation error $\varepsilon$. The best possible rate $N^{-n / d}$ is achieved if $s=r$, that is if $v \in H^{r}(\Omega)$.

Note that we later will employ the definitions, properties and cost complexities individually for each subdomain $\Omega_{i} i=1,2$, that is, we will deal with two multiscale analyses

$$
V_{0}^{(i)} \subset V_{1}^{(i)} \subset V_{2}^{(i)} \subset \cdots \subset L^{2}\left(\Omega_{i}\right), \quad i=1,2
$$

## 3. Singular value decomposition

We intend to numerically represent functions $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$ on tensor product domains $\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}$ in the most efficient way. One way to solve this approximation problem is to use an ansatz by means of tensor products which separates the variables $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$. We consider the approximation

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \approx \sum_{\ell=0}^{M} \alpha_{\ell} \varphi_{\ell}(\mathbf{x}) \psi_{\ell}(\mathbf{y}) \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

with certain coefficients $\alpha_{\ell} \in \mathbb{R}$ and normalized functions $\varphi_{\ell} \in L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)$ and $\psi_{\ell} \in L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)$. Such an approximation is called low rank approximation.

The decay of the $\alpha_{\ell}$ is important for the fast convergence (in terms of $M$ ) of the series (3.5). As we will see, the convergence depends on the smoothness of the function $f$ to be approximated. Moreover, besides determining the coefficients $\left\{\alpha_{\ell}\right\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$, a numerical scheme to compute (3.5) needs to approximate the functions $\left\{\varphi_{\ell}\right\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\left\{\psi_{\ell}\right\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ up to an accuracy corresponding to that of (3.5).

It is well known (see e.g. [9, 21, 28] for the proof) that, with respect to the number $M$ of terms, the best possible representation of a function $f \in L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$ in the $L^{2}$-sense is given by the Karhunen-Lòeve / singular value decomposition. To this end, we consider the integral operator

$$
\mathcal{S}: L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right) \rightarrow L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right), \quad(\mathcal{S} u)(\mathbf{y}):=\int_{\Omega_{1}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) u(\mathbf{x}) d \mathbf{x}
$$

Its adjoint is

$$
\mathcal{S}^{\star}: L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right) \rightarrow L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right), \quad\left(\mathcal{S}^{\star} u\right)(\mathbf{x}):=\int_{\Omega_{2}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) u(\mathbf{y}) d \mathbf{y} .
$$

Then, to obtain the representation (3.5) we need to compute the eigenvalues of the integral operator

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{K}=\mathcal{S}^{\star} \mathcal{S}: L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right) \rightarrow L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right), \quad(\mathcal{K} u)(\mathbf{x}):=\int_{\Omega_{1}} k\left(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{\prime}\right) u\left(\mathbf{x}^{\prime}\right) d \mathbf{x}^{\prime} \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

whose kernel function is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
k\left(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{\prime}\right)=\int_{\Omega_{2}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) f\left(\mathbf{x}^{\prime}, \mathbf{y}\right) d \mathbf{y} \in L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{1}\right) \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

This is a Hilbert-Schmidt kernel. Thus, the associated integral operator $\mathcal{K}$ is compact. Moreover, since $\mathcal{K}$ is self-adjoint, there exists a decomposition into eigenpairs $\left(\lambda_{\ell}, \varphi_{\ell}\right)$ which fulfill

$$
\mathcal{K} \varphi_{\ell}=\lambda_{\ell} \varphi_{\ell}, \quad \ell \in \mathbb{N},
$$

with non-negative eigenvalues $\lambda_{1} \geq \lambda_{2} \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_{m} \rightarrow 0$ and eigenfunctions $\left\{\varphi_{\ell}\right\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$, which constitute an orthonormal basis in $L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)$.

We now define for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\lambda_{\ell}>0$ the function $\psi_{\ell} \in L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi_{\ell}(\mathbf{y})=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}}\left(\mathcal{S} \varphi_{\ell}\right)(\mathbf{y})=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}} \int_{\Omega_{1}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \varphi_{\ell}(\mathbf{x}) d \mathbf{x} . \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

This constitutes a second sequence of orthonormal functions since

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\psi_{k}, \psi_{\ell}\right)_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)} & =\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{k} \lambda_{\ell}}}\left(\mathcal{S} \varphi_{k}, \mathcal{S} \varphi_{\ell}\right)_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{k} \lambda_{\ell}}}\left(\mathcal{K} \varphi_{k}, \varphi_{\ell}\right)_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)} \\
& =\frac{\lambda_{k}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{k} \lambda_{\ell}}}\left(\varphi_{k}, \varphi_{\ell}\right)_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}=\delta_{k, \ell} .
\end{aligned}
$$

If $\lambda_{\ell}=0$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ we can extend this collection of functions properly to obtain an orthonormal basis $\left\{\psi_{\ell}\right\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)$. Due to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}} \varphi_{\ell}(\mathbf{x})=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}}\left(\mathcal{S}^{\star} \mathcal{S} \varphi_{\ell}\right)(\mathbf{x})=\left(\mathcal{S}^{\star} \psi_{\ell}\right)(\mathbf{x})=\int_{\Omega_{2}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \psi_{\ell}(\mathbf{z}) d \mathbf{z} \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

we finally obtain the representation

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}} \varphi_{\ell}(\mathbf{x}) \psi_{\ell}(\mathbf{y}) . \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

In view of (3.8) and (3.9), this equation is easily verified by testing with the othonormal basis $\left\{\varphi_{k} \otimes \psi_{\ell}\right\}_{k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$.

Remark 3.1. The adjoint kernel $\widetilde{k}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is just obtained by interchanging the roles of $\Omega_{1}$ and $\Omega_{2}$, i.e.,

$$
\widetilde{k}\left(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}^{\prime}\right)=\int_{\Omega_{1}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) f\left(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}^{\prime}\right) d \mathbf{x} \in L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2} \times \Omega_{2}\right) .
$$

Then, one has the integral operator

$$
\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}=\mathcal{S S}^{\star}: L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right) \rightarrow L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right), \quad(\widetilde{\mathcal{K}} u)(\mathbf{y}):=\int_{\Omega_{2}} \widetilde{k}\left(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}^{\prime}\right) u\left(\mathbf{y}^{\prime}\right) d \mathbf{y}^{\prime}
$$

Again there exists a decomposition into eigenpairs

$$
\widetilde{\mathcal{K}} \widetilde{\varphi}_{\ell}=\widetilde{\lambda}_{\ell} \widetilde{\varphi}_{\ell}, \quad \ell \in \mathbb{N},
$$

with non-negative eigenvalues $\widetilde{\lambda}_{1} \geq \widetilde{\lambda}_{2} \geq \cdots \geq \widetilde{\lambda}_{m} \rightarrow 0$ and eigenfunctions $\widetilde{\varphi}_{\ell} \in L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)$. We also obtain a second sequence of orthonormal functions $\widetilde{\psi}_{\ell} \in L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)$ analogously to (3.8). The functions $\left\{\widetilde{\varphi}_{\ell}\right\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\left\{\widetilde{\psi}_{\ell}\right\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ will be the same as before but now their roles are exchanged. Moreover, the eigenvalues $\lambda_{\ell}$ and $\widetilde{\lambda}_{\ell}$ of $\mathcal{K}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}$ coincide.

We shall prove the following auxiliary result concerning the mapping properties of the integral operators $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}^{\star}$. To this end, for $s>0$ we mean by $H^{-s}(\Omega):=\left(H^{s}(\Omega)\right)^{\prime}$ the dual of the Sobolev space $H^{s}(\Omega)$ (which is usually denoted by $\widetilde{H}^{-s}(\Omega)$ ).

Lemma 3.2. Assume that $f \in H^{p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$. Then, the operators

$$
\mathcal{S}: H^{-s}\left(\Omega_{1}\right) \rightarrow H^{p-s}\left(\Omega_{2}\right), \quad \mathcal{S}^{\star}: H^{-s}\left(\Omega_{2}\right) \rightarrow H^{p-s}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)
$$

are continuous for all $s \in[0, p]$.
Proof. From $H^{p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right) \subset H_{m i x}^{0, p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$ it follows that $f \in H_{m i x}^{0, p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times\right.$ $\left.\Omega_{2}\right)$. Therefore, the operator $\mathcal{S}: L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right) \rightarrow H^{p}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)$ is continuous since

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{S} u\|_{H^{p}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)} & =\sup _{\|v\|_{H}-p\left(\Omega_{2}\right)=1}(\mathcal{S} u, v)_{L_{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)} \\
& =\sup _{\|v\|_{H}-p\left(\Omega_{2}\right)=1}(f, u \otimes v)_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)} \\
& \leq \sup _{\|v\|_{H}-p\left(\Omega_{2}\right)=1}\|f\|_{H_{m i x}^{0, p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)}\|u \otimes v\|_{H_{m i x}^{0,-p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)} \\
& \sim\|f\|_{H_{m i x}^{0, p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)}\|u\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that we have used here that $H_{\text {mix }}^{0,-p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right) \cong L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right) \otimes H^{-p}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)$.
In complete analogy one shows that $\mathcal{S}^{\star}: L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right) \rightarrow H^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)$ is continuous which proves the desired assertion for $s=0$. By duality one also infers the assertion for $s=p$. The assertion for $s \in(0, p)$ is finally obtained by interpolation.

With the above lemma we are able to determine the decay rate of the eigenvalues of the integral operator $\mathcal{K}=\mathcal{S}^{\star} \mathcal{S}$ with kernel (3.7). Note here that our result improves the one from [28] by a factor of two since we exploit the regularity in both variables of the kernel function which satisfies only $k \in H_{m i x}^{p, p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{1}\right)$.

Theorem 3.3. Consider $f \in H^{p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$ with associated kernel $k$ from (3.7) and associated integral operator $\mathcal{K}$ from (3.6). Then, the eigenvalues $\left\{\lambda_{\ell}\right\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $\mathcal{K}$ decay like

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{\ell} \lesssim \ell^{-\frac{2 p}{\min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}} \quad \text { as } \ell \rightarrow \infty . \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. We shall investigate the dependance of the decay of the eigenvalues of the integral operator $\mathcal{K}=\mathcal{S}^{\star} \mathcal{S}$ on the smoothness $p$ of $f$. To this end, we introduce new finite element spaces $U_{N} \subset L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)$, which consist of $N$ discontinuous, piecewise polynomial functions of total degree $p$ on a quasi-uniform triangulation of $\Omega_{2}$ with mesh width $h_{N} \sim N^{-1 / n_{2}}$. Then, there holds the following approximation result for the $L^{2}$-orthogonal projection $P_{N}: L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right) \rightarrow U_{N}$ :

$$
\left\|\left(I-P_{N}\right) w\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)} \leq c_{p} N^{-p / n_{2}}\|w\|_{H^{p}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}
$$

provided that $w \in H^{p}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)$. Then, since $\mathcal{S}^{\star} P_{N} \mathcal{S}: L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right) \rightarrow L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)$ is an operator of finite rank $N$, the min-max principle of Courant-Fischer implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \lambda_{N+1}=\min _{\substack{V \subset L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right) \\
\operatorname{dim} V^{ \pm} \leq N}} \max _{\substack{u \in V \\
\|u\|^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}}(\mathcal{K} u, u)_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)} \\
& \leq \max _{\substack{u \perp \operatorname{img}\left(\mathcal{S}^{\star} P_{N} \mathcal{S}\right) \\
\|u\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}=1}}\left(\mathcal{S}^{\star} \mathcal{S} u, u\right)_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)} \\
& =\max _{\substack{u \perp i m g\left(\mathcal{S}^{\star} P_{N} \mathcal{S}\right) \\
\|u\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}=1}}\left(\mathcal{S}^{\star}\left(I-P_{N}\right) \mathcal{S} u, u\right)_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)} \\
& =\max _{\substack{u \perp i m g\left(\mathcal{S}^{\star} P_{N} \mathcal{S}\right) \\
\|u\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}=1}}\left(\left(I-P_{N}\right) \mathcal{S} u,\left(I-P_{N}\right) \mathcal{S} u\right)_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)} \\
& \leq \sup _{\|u\|_{L 2\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}=1}\left\|\left(I-P_{N}\right) \mathcal{S} u\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}^{2} \\
& \lesssim N^{-2 p / n_{2}} \sup _{\|u\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}=1}\|\mathcal{S} u\|_{H^{p}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\mathcal{S}: L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right) \rightarrow H^{p}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)$ is continuous according to Lemma 3.2, we arrive at $\lambda_{N+1} \lesssim N^{-2 p / n_{2}}$. Applying the same arguments to the operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}$, one gets the decay rate $\lambda_{N+1} \lesssim N^{-2 p / n_{1}}$. Substituting finally $N+1$ by $\ell$ yields the desired result.

Altogether, if $f \in H^{p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$, then Theorem 3.3 implies that the associated coeffcients $\left\{\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}\right\}$ in the expansion (3.10) of $f$ decay like $\sqrt{\lambda}_{\ell} \lesssim \ell^{-p / \min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}$. This leads to the following theorem.

Theorem 3.4. Let $f \in H^{p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$ and $p>\min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\} / 2$. Then it holds

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|f-\sum_{\ell=0}^{M} \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}\left(\varphi_{\ell} \otimes \psi_{\ell}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)} \lesssim M^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{p}{\min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}} . \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that $n_{1} \leq n_{2}$. Then, due to $\lambda_{\ell} \sim \ell^{-2 p / n_{1}}$ by Theorem 3.3, we obtain by the orthonormality of the function sets $\left\{\phi_{\ell}\right\}$ and $\left\{\psi_{\ell}\right\}$ that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|f-\sum_{\ell=0}^{M} \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}\left(\varphi_{\ell} \otimes \psi_{\ell}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)}^{2} & =\left\|\sum_{\ell=M+1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}\left(\varphi_{\ell} \otimes \psi_{\ell}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)}^{2} \\
& =\sum_{\ell=M+1}^{\infty} \lambda_{\ell} \lesssim \sum_{\ell=M+1}^{\infty} \ell^{-\frac{2 p}{n_{1}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $2 p / n_{1}>1$ we can estimate the sum by an integral as

$$
\sum_{\ell=M+1}^{\infty} \ell^{-\frac{2 p}{n_{1}}} \leq \int_{M}^{\infty} x^{-\frac{2 p}{n_{1}}} d x=\frac{M^{1-\frac{2 p}{n_{1}}}}{\frac{2 p}{n_{1}}-1}
$$

which leads to the desired result (3.12).
Consequently, to ensure the error bound

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|f-\sum_{\ell=0}^{M} \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}\left(\varphi_{\ell} \otimes \psi_{\ell}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)} \lesssim \varepsilon \tag{3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

we need to choose the expansion degree $M$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
M \sim \varepsilon^{\frac{2 \min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}{\min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}-2 p}} . \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark 3.5. (1) Regularity in terms of mixed derivatives does not further improve the results. The property $f \in H_{m i x}^{p, p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$ again yields the estimate $\lambda_{\ell} \lesssim \ell^{-\frac{2 p}{\max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}}$ for the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{K}$.
(2) The use of the Sobolev regularity might give a too low decay rate (3.11). For example, for the exponential kernel $k(x, y)=$ $\exp (-|x-y|)$ on the unit square, we have $k \in H^{3 / 2-\delta}((0,1) \times$ $(0,1))$ for all $\delta>0$ but we observe $\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}} \sim \ell^{-2}$ instead of $\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}} \sim$ $\ell^{-3 / 2}$, see Fig. 6.3 in Section 6. Here, we expect that the use of Besov regularity would give the correct decay.
(3) Our considerations and thus estimate (3.12) do not apply if $0 \leq p \leq \min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\} / 2$. However, it still holds $\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \lambda_{\ell}<\infty$ since $\mathcal{K}$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator.

Depending on the smoothness of $f$, we are able to prove the following result on the regularity of the functons in the collections $\left\{\varphi_{\ell}\right\}$ and $\left\{\psi_{\ell}\right\}$. This result will be essential for any numerical computation of the truncated singular value decomposition.

Lemma 3.6. Let $f \in H^{p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$. Then, the eigenfunctions $\left\{\varphi_{\ell}\right\}$ and $\left\{\psi_{\ell}\right\}$ are in $H^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)$ and $H^{p}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)$, respectively, and satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\varphi_{\ell}\right\|_{H^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}}, \quad\left\|\psi_{\ell}\right\|_{H^{p}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}}, \quad \ell \in \mathbb{N} . \tag{3.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. In view of (3.9) and Lemma 3.2, we deduce

$$
\left\|\varphi_{\ell}\right\|_{H^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}}\left\|\mathcal{S}^{\star} \psi_{\ell}\right\|_{H^{p}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}}\left\|\psi_{\ell}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}}
$$

for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. The second estimate is proven in complete analogy.
So far, we used an exact description of the eigenfunctions. However this does not hold in practice. Instead, the eigenvalues $\left\{\lambda_{\ell}\right\}_{\ell=1}^{M}$ and eigenfunctions $\left\{\varphi_{\ell}\right\}_{\ell=1}^{M}$ and $\left\{\psi_{\ell}\right\}_{\ell=1}^{M}$ need to be approximately computed in the finite element spaces $V_{j}^{(i)} \subset L^{2}\left(\Omega_{i}\right)$, introduced in Section 2. According to (2.3) and (3.15), when we spend $N$ degrees of freedom,
we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\|\varphi_{\ell}-\varphi_{\ell, N}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)} \lesssim N^{-\frac{\min \{p, r\}}{n_{1}}}\left\|\varphi_{\ell}\right\|_{H^{\min \{p, r\}(\Omega)}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}} N^{-\frac{\min \{p, r\}}{n_{1}}},  \tag{3.16}\\
& \left\|\psi_{\ell}-\psi_{\ell, N}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)} \lesssim N^{-\frac{\min \{p, r\}}{n_{2}}}\left\|\psi_{\ell}\right\|_{H^{\min \{p, r\}(\Omega)}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}} N^{-\frac{\min \{p, r\}}{n_{2}}}
\end{align*}
$$

Here, $\varphi_{\ell, N}$ and $\psi_{\ell, N}$ denote the numerical approximations to $\varphi_{\ell}$ and $\psi_{\ell}$, respectively.

According to (3.16), to ensure $\left\|\varphi_{\ell}-\varphi_{\ell, N}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)} \lesssim \varepsilon / \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell} M}$ (we will later see that this is the proper accuracy), we have to spent (cf. (3.14))

$$
N_{\varphi} \sim\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{M}}\right)^{-\frac{n_{1}}{\min \{r, p\}}} \sim \varepsilon^{\frac{2 p n_{1}}{\left(\min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}-2 p\right) \min \{r, p\}}}
$$

unknowns for the representation of $\varphi_{\ell, N}$ and, to ensure $\left\|\psi_{\ell}-\psi_{\ell, N}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)} \lesssim$ $\varepsilon / \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell} M}$, we have to spent

$$
N_{\psi} \sim\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{M}}\right)^{-\frac{n_{2}}{\min \{r, p\}}} \sim \varepsilon^{\frac{2 p n_{2}}{\left(\min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}-2 p\right) \min \{r, p\}}}
$$

unknowns for the representation of $\psi_{\ell, N}$, respectively. In the sequel, we will spend always $N:=\max \left\{N_{\varphi}, N_{\psi}\right\}$ degrees of freedom which does not deteriorate the cost complexity. In particular, $N$ does not depend on $\ell$, i.e., all eigenfunctions $\left\{\varphi_{N, \ell}\right\}$ and $\left\{\psi_{N, \ell}\right\}$ are approximated in the same ansatz spaces.

Remark 3.7. If $p>r$, then we even may estimate

$$
\left\|\varphi_{\ell}\right\|_{H^{r}(\Omega)} \lesssim\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}}\right)^{\frac{r}{p}}, \quad\left\|\psi_{\ell}\right\|_{H^{r}(\Omega)} \lesssim\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}}\right)^{\frac{r}{p}}
$$

by using interpolation arguments. Hence, (3.16) can be improved by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\|\varphi_{\ell}-\varphi_{\ell, N}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)} \lesssim \lambda_{\ell}^{-\frac{\min \{r, p\}}{2 p}} N^{-\frac{\min \{p, r\}}{n_{1}}}, \\
& \left\|\psi_{\ell}-\psi_{\ell, N}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)} \lesssim \lambda_{\ell}^{-\frac{\min \{r, p\}}{2 p}} N^{-\frac{\min \{p, r\}}{n_{2}}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

As a conseqence, if $p>r$, the number of unknowns for approximating the eigenfunctions can be reduced when $\ell$ increases. However, to exploit this fact for the computation of the truncated singular value decomposition, one needs the specific information on the smoothness index $p$.

We assume that the approximate eigenfunctions are normalized and pairwise orthogonal, i.e., for $1 \leq \ell, \ell^{\prime} \leq M$ we have

$$
\int_{\Omega_{1}} \varphi_{\ell, N}(\mathbf{x}) \varphi_{\ell^{\prime}, N}(\mathbf{x}) d \mathbf{x}=\delta_{\ell, \ell^{\prime}}, \quad \int_{\Omega_{2}} \psi_{\ell, N}(\mathbf{y}) \psi_{\ell^{\prime}, N}(\mathbf{y}) d \mathbf{y}=\delta_{\ell, \ell^{\prime}} .
$$

Concerning the approximation of the $M$ largest eigenvalues in the space $V_{N}$, defined via their Rayleigh quotients

$$
\lambda_{\ell, N}=\int_{\Omega_{1}} \int_{\Omega_{1}} k\left(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^{\prime}\right) \varphi_{\ell, N}(\mathbf{x}) \varphi_{\ell, N}\left(\mathbf{x}^{\prime}\right) d \mathbf{x} d \mathbf{x}^{\prime}, \quad \ell=1,2, \ldots, M
$$

we assume the following estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leq \lambda_{\ell}-\lambda_{\ell, N} \lesssim \lambda_{\ell}\left\|\varphi_{\ell}-\varphi_{\ell, N}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}^{2}, \quad \ell=1,2, \ldots, M \tag{3.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

We emphasize that these assumptions, in particular (3.17), are all satisfied if one computes the approximation $\left\{\left(\lambda_{N, \ell}, \varphi_{N, \ell}\right)_{\ell=1}^{M}\right.$ to the eigenpairs $\left\{\left(\lambda_{\ell}, \varphi_{\ell}\right)\right\}_{\ell=1}^{M}$ with a Ritz-Galerkin method in the space $V_{j}^{(1)}$ with $\operatorname{dim} V_{j}^{(1)} \sim N$. For the proof we refer the reader to [8].

Based on (3.12), (3.16) and (3.17), we can estimate the error of the discretized truncated singular value decomposition.

Theorem 3.8. Let $f \in H^{p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$ and choose

$$
M \sim \varepsilon^{\frac{2 \min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}{\min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}-2 p}}, \quad N \sim \varepsilon^{\frac{2 p \max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}{\left(\min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}-2 p\right) \min \{r, p\}}} .
$$

Then, the truncated singular value decomposition satisfies the error estimate

$$
\left\|f-\sum_{\ell=0}^{M} \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell, N}}\left(\varphi_{\ell, N} \otimes \psi_{\ell, N}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)} \lesssim \varepsilon
$$

uniformly in $\varepsilon>0$.
Proof. It holds

$$
\begin{aligned}
E: & =\left\|\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}\left(\varphi_{\ell} \otimes \psi_{\ell}\right)-\sum_{\ell=0}^{M} \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell, N}}\left(\varphi_{\ell, N} \otimes \psi_{\ell, N}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)}^{2} \\
\leq & \left\|\sum_{\ell=M+1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}\left(\varphi_{\ell} \otimes \psi_{\ell}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)}^{2} \\
& \quad+\left\|\sum_{\ell=0}^{M} \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}\left(\varphi_{\ell} \otimes \psi_{\ell}\right)-\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell, N}}\left(\varphi_{\ell, N} \otimes \psi_{\ell, N}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

According to (3.12) and (3.13) the squared truncation error is bounded by $c \varepsilon^{2}$, and thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E \lesssim \varepsilon^{2}+\left\|\sum_{\ell=0}^{M}\left(\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}-\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell, N}}\right)\left(\varphi_{\ell} \otimes \psi_{\ell}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)}^{2} \\
&+\left\|\sum_{\ell=0}^{M} \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell, N}}\left(\varphi_{\ell} \otimes\left(\psi_{\ell}-\psi_{\ell, N}\right)\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)}^{2} \\
&+\left\|\sum_{\ell=0}^{M} \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell, N}}\left(\left(\varphi_{\ell}-\varphi_{\ell, N}\right) \otimes \psi_{\ell, N}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)}^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We now estimate the three terms on the right hand side separately. In view of (3.17), we have $\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}} \geq \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell, N}}$ and, with (3.16), we obtain

$$
0 \leq\left|\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}-\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell, N}}\right|^{2} \leq \lambda_{\ell}-\lambda_{\ell, N} \lesssim \lambda_{\ell}\left\|\varphi_{\ell}-\varphi_{\ell, N}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}^{2} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^{2}}{M}
$$

This yields

$$
\begin{align*}
\| \sum_{\ell=0}^{M}\left(\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}-\right. & \left.\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell, N}}\right)\left(\varphi_{\ell} \otimes \psi_{\ell}\right) \|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)}^{2}  \tag{3.18}\\
& =\sum_{\ell=0}^{M}\left|\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}}-\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell, N}}\right|^{2} \lesssim \sum_{\ell=0}^{M} \frac{\varepsilon^{2}}{M} \lesssim \varepsilon^{2} .
\end{align*}
$$

Next, with $\lambda_{\ell, N} \leq \lambda_{\ell}$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\|\sum_{\ell=0}^{M} \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell, N}}\left(\varphi_{\ell} \otimes\left(\psi_{\ell}-\psi_{\ell, N}\right)\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)}^{2}  \tag{3.19}\\
& \quad=\sum_{\ell=0}^{M} \lambda_{\ell, N}\left\|\varphi_{\ell} \otimes\left(\psi_{\ell}-\psi_{\ell, N}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)}^{2} \\
& \quad \leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{M} \lambda_{\ell}\left\|\varphi_{\ell}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1}\right)}^{2}\left\|\psi_{\ell}-\psi_{\ell, N}\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{2}\right)}^{2} \\
& \quad \lesssim \sum_{\ell=0}^{M} \frac{\varepsilon^{2}}{M} \lesssim \varepsilon^{2},
\end{align*}
$$

and likewise

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\sum_{\ell=0}^{M} \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell, N}}\left(\left(\varphi_{\ell}-\varphi_{\ell, N}\right) \otimes \psi_{\ell, N}\right)\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)}^{2} \lesssim \varepsilon^{2} \tag{3.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

Plugging (3.18)-(3.20) into the above estimate of $E$ finally leads to the desired estimate $E \lesssim \varepsilon^{2}$.

Altogether, since we have to deal with $M$ eigenfunctions with $N$ coefficients each, we arrive at the following theorem.

Theorem 3.9. The number of degrees of freedom needed to approximate a function $f \in H^{p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$ by the singular value decomposition approach (3.5) with (3.16) and (3.17) to a prescribed accuracy $\varepsilon$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{dof}_{s v d}(\varepsilon)=M \cdot N \sim \varepsilon^{-\frac{2 \min \left\{\{, p\} \min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}+2 p \max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}\right.}{\left.\left(2 p-\min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}\right) \min \left\{r_{p}\right\}\right\}}} \tag{3.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

We emphasize that the estimate (3.21) does not include the work to be spent for computing the singular values nor the eigenfunctions. Here, a naive approach would result in a cost complexity of order $M \cdot N^{2}$, the use of fast methods for nonlocal operators would result in an almost linear or even linear complexity per eigenpair. Note that in any case at least linear complexity $\mathcal{O}(M \cdot N)$ is required, see e.g. [6, 7, 28].

## 4. Regular sparse grids

In general one uses finite elements to approximate the functions on $L^{2}\left(\Omega_{i}\right), i=1,2$. Then, particularly for applying multiscale techniques, one has a sequence of nested trial spaces

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{0}^{(i)} \subset V_{1}^{(i)} \subset V_{2}^{(i)} \subset \cdots \subset L^{2}\left(\Omega_{i}\right), \quad i=1,2 \tag{4.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

called multiscale analysis.
This gives a second method to approximate functions in tensor product spaces: By choosing complementary spaces

$$
W_{j}^{(i)}=\operatorname{span}\left\{\xi_{j, k}^{(i)}: k \in \nabla_{j}^{(i)}:=\Delta_{j}^{(i)} \backslash \Delta_{j-1}^{(i)}\right\}, \quad i=1,2,
$$

such that

$$
V_{j}^{(i)}=W_{j}^{(i)} \oplus V_{j-1}^{(i)}, \quad V_{0}^{(i)}=W_{0}^{(i)}
$$

we can approximate a function $f \in L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$ in the so called regular sparse grid space, see [4],

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{J}^{(1)} \otimes V_{J}^{(2)}:=\bigoplus_{j_{1}+j_{2} \leq J} W_{j_{1}}^{(1)} \otimes W_{j_{2}}^{(2)} \tag{4.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then, a function $\widehat{f_{J}} \in V_{J}^{(1)} \otimes V_{J}^{(2)}$ is represented as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widehat{f}_{J}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})=\sum_{j_{1}+j_{2} \leq J} \sum_{k_{1} \in \nabla_{j_{1}}^{(1)}} \sum_{k_{2} \in \nabla_{j_{2}}^{(2)}} \beta_{\left(j_{1}, k_{1}\right),\left(j_{2}, k_{2}\right)} \xi_{j_{1}, k_{1}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}) \xi_{j_{2}, k_{2}}^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) \tag{4.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note here that the regular sparse grid space has substantially less unknowns than the full tensor product space

$$
V_{J}^{(1)} \otimes V_{J}^{(2)}:=\bigoplus_{j_{1}, j_{2} \leq J} W_{j_{1}}^{(1)} \otimes W_{j_{2}}^{(2)}
$$

Lemma 4.1. There holds

$$
\operatorname{dim} V_{J}^{(1)} \otimes V_{J}^{(2)}= \begin{cases}J 2^{J n_{1}}, & \text { if } n_{1}=n_{2}, \\ 2^{J \max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}, & \text { if } n_{1} \neq n_{2} .\end{cases}
$$

Proof. The first assertion is already well known, see e.g. [4]. Here, we shall assume without loss of generality that $n_{1} \geq n_{2}$. Then, it follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j_{1}+j_{2} \leq J} 2^{j_{1} n_{1}+j_{2} n_{2}} & =2^{J n_{1}} \sum_{j_{1}=0}^{J} 2^{\left(j_{1}-J\right) n_{1}} \sum_{j_{2}=0}^{J-j_{1}} 2^{j_{2} n_{2}} \\
& =2^{J n_{1}} \sum_{j_{1}=0}^{J} 2^{\left(j_{1}-J\right)\left(n_{1}-n_{2}\right)} \\
& \lesssim \begin{cases}J 2^{J n_{1}}, & \text { if } n_{1}=n_{2}, \\
2^{J n_{1}}, & \text { if } n_{1}>n_{2} .\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

Sparse grids can be constructed via hierarchical bases, interpolets and wavelet-like bases (see e.g. [11, 26, 27, 28, 31]) or even directly by finite elements in terms of frames (see e.g. [10, 12, 18]). For a survey on sparse grids we refer the reader to [4] and the references therein.

From the approximation property (2.3) it follows that the order of approximation for a function $f \in H^{s}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)(0 \leq s \leq r)$ in the full
tensor product space $V_{j} \otimes V_{j}$ is $s$. Nonetheless, according to [4, 11, 25], by spending additional smoothness in terms of mixed Sobolev spaces $H_{m i x}^{s, s}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$, essentially the same approximation order is provided in the regular sparse grid space (4.23). The following result has been proven in [25], see also [13].

Lemma 4.2. Let $f \in H_{m i x}^{s, s}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right), 0 \leq s \leq r$. Then, the $L^{2}$ orthogonal projection $\widehat{P}_{J}$ onto the sparse tensor product space ${\widehat{V_{J} \otimes V_{J}}}$ satisfies

$$
\left\|f-\widehat{P}_{J} f\right\|_{L^{2}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)} \lesssim \begin{cases}2^{-J s} \sqrt{J}\|f\|_{H^{s, s}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)}, & \text { if } s=r  \tag{4.25}\\ 2^{-J s}\|f\|_{H^{s, s}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)}, & \text { if } 0 \leq s<r\end{cases}
$$

Thus, in view of Lemma 4.1, for a given function $f \in H_{m i x}^{s, s}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$ with $s \geq r$ and a desired accuracy $\varepsilon>0$, we essentially, i.e., up to logarithmic terms, have to spent

$$
\begin{equation*}
N \sim \varepsilon^{-\frac{\max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}{r}} \tag{4.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

unknowns to guarantee this accuracy. Note that this rate is essentially of optimal order in the present situation, i.e., for the case $s \geq r$. If $f$ provides less smoothness, say $f \in H_{m i x}^{s, s}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$ and $s<r$, then (4.25) induces the reduced approximation rate $2^{-J s}$. Since the the sparse grid space owns at most $J 2^{J \max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}$ degrees of freedom, we conclude that essentially

$$
N \sim \varepsilon^{-\frac{\max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}{s}}
$$

degrees of freedom are needed to guarantee an accuracy of $\varepsilon$. Thus, altogether, we essentially obtain for $f \in H_{\text {mix }}^{s, s}(\Omega \times \Omega), s \geq 0$, the rate

$$
N \sim \varepsilon^{-\frac{\max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}{\min \{s, r\}}} .
$$

If we now assume as above that $f$ is an isotropic function such that $f \in H^{p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$, we conclude, due to $H^{p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right) \subset H_{m i x}^{\frac{p}{2}, \frac{p}{2}}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$, that $f \in H_{m i x}^{\frac{p}{2}, \frac{p}{2}}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$. This leads to the following theorem.

Theorem 4.3. The number of degrees of freedom needed to approximate a function $f \in H^{p}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$ to a prescribed accuracy $\varepsilon$ by the regular sparse grid approach (4.24) is essentially

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{dof}_{s g}(\varepsilon)=N \sim \varepsilon^{-\frac{2 \max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}{\min \{p, 2 r\}}} . \tag{4.27}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark 4.4. Following the idea of an equilibrated cost-benefit rate (see [4]), one arrives at the optimized sparse grid

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{J}^{(1)} \otimes V_{J}^{(2)}:=\bigoplus_{j_{1} \sqrt{\frac{n_{1}+r}{n_{2}+r}}+j_{2} \sqrt{\frac{n_{2}+r}{n_{1}+r}} \leq J} W_{j_{1}}^{(1)} \otimes W_{j_{2}}^{(2)} \tag{4.28}
\end{equation*}
$$

As we will show in a forthcoming paper such a problem-adapted sparse grid is superior to the standard regular sparse grid (4.23) if the spatial dimensions of $\Omega_{1}$ and $\Omega_{2}$ differ, i.e., if $n_{1} \neq n_{2}$.

## 5. Comparison of the two approximations

Now, we will compare the two approximation schemes. We are interested for which values of $p, r, n_{1}$ and $n_{2}$ the regular sparse grid approach is asymptotically superior to the singular value decomposition. To this end, we shall distinguish three regimes of the smoothness parameter $p$ where one should have in mind the condition $p \geq \min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}$. Nevertheless, the subsequent discussion has to be carefully interpreted, cf. Remark 3.5.
5.1. The case $\boldsymbol{p} \geq \mathbf{2 r}$. In this case it holds $f \in H_{m i x}^{r, r}\left(\Omega_{1} \times \Omega_{2}\right)$. Then, according to Theorem 4.3, it follows that the regular sparse grid approach produces essentially optimal approximation rates, whereas the truncated singular value decomposition is only of essentially optimal complexity if $f$ is analytical. This follows from the fact that $M \sim|\log (\varepsilon)|^{\min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}$ dominating singular values are needed, see [28].
5.2. The case $2 \boldsymbol{r}>\boldsymbol{p} \geq \boldsymbol{r}$. According to Theorems 3.9 and 4.3, the truncated singular value decomposition has the complexity

$$
\operatorname{dof}_{s v d}(\varepsilon) \sim \varepsilon^{-\frac{2 r \min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}+2 p \max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}{\left(2 p-\min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}\right) r}}
$$

and the regular sparse grid approach has the complexity

$$
\operatorname{dof}_{s g}(\varepsilon) \sim \varepsilon^{-\frac{2 \max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}{p}} .
$$

The sparse grid approximation is asymptotically superior to the truncated singular value decomposition if $\operatorname{dof}_{s g}(\varepsilon) \lesssim \operatorname{dof}_{s v d}(\varepsilon)$ which holds if

$$
\frac{2 \max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}{p} \leq \frac{2 r \min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}+2 p \max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}{\left(2 p-\min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}\right) r} .
$$

One readily infers that this inequality is equivalent to

$$
0 \leq p^{2}-r p\left(1+\frac{\left|n_{1}-n_{2}\right|}{\max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}\right)+r \min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}=: g(p)
$$

The polynomial $g(p)$ cannot be easily discussed for general values of $p, r, n_{1}$ and $n_{2}$. But at least for the simple case $n=n_{1}=n_{2}$, the polynomial $g(p)$ might be bounded from below by

$$
g(p)=p^{2}-r p+r n \geq r p-r p+r n \geq 0
$$

due to $p \geq r$. Thus, in this case the sparse grid approach exhibits higher rates of convergence.
5.3. The case $\boldsymbol{r}>\boldsymbol{p} \geq \mathbf{0}$. Theorems 3.9 and 4.3 lead to the complexities

$$
\operatorname{dof}_{s v d}(\varepsilon) \sim \varepsilon^{-\frac{2\left(n_{1}+n_{2}\right)}{2 p-\min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}}
$$

for the singular value decomposition and

$$
\operatorname{dof}_{s g}(\varepsilon) \sim \varepsilon^{-\frac{2 \max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}{p}}
$$

for the regular sparse grid approach. Now, it holds $\operatorname{dof}_{s g}(\varepsilon) \lesssim \operatorname{dof}_{s v d}(\varepsilon)$ if the inequality

$$
\frac{2 \max \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}{p} \leq \frac{2\left(n_{1}+n_{2}\right)}{2 p-\min \left\{n_{1}, n_{2}\right\}}
$$

is satisfied. Straightforward manipulation yields the condition

$$
n_{1} n_{2}>p\left|n_{1}-n_{2}\right|
$$

for the superiority of the sparse grid approximation. Especially this condition is satisfied if the dimensions $n_{1}$ and $n_{2}$ coincide.

Let us remark here that in the situation $r>p$ an approximation in the full tensor product space is of the same complexity as the approximation by regular sparse grids.

## 6. Numerical experiments

In our numerical experiments we consider the special situation that $f$ is a symmetric function (i.e., $f(x, y)=f(y, x))$ and that $\Omega_{1}=\Omega_{2}=$ $(0,1)$ (i.e., $n_{1}=n_{2}=1$ ). Hence, the singular value decomposition of $f$ is just its spectral decomposition.


Figure 6.1. The sparse grid approximation of the Gauss kernel converges essentially like $N^{-2}$.

On level $j$, we subdivide $(0,1)$ into $2^{j}$ intervals of length $2^{-j}$ which leads to $2^{j}+1$ ansatz functions. The approximation spaces $V_{j}$ under consideration are then generated by continuous piecewise linear polynomials on an equidistant subdivision of the interval $(0,1)$ (i.e., $r=2$ ).
6.1. Gauss kernel. In our first example we discuss the approximation of the Gauss kernel

$$
f(x, y)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma} \exp \left(-\frac{|x-y|^{2}}{\sigma^{2}}\right), \quad \sigma>0
$$

Since $f$ is known to be analytical and thus arbitrarily smooth, particularly $f \in H_{\text {mix }}^{2,2}((0,1) \times(0,1))$, the regular sparse grid approach converges with the optimal rate $h_{j}^{2} \sqrt{j} \sim 4^{-j} \sqrt{j}$. This is also observed by our numerical results, see Fig. 6.1. Of course, the smaller the value of $\sigma$ the larger the constant which appears in front of the complexity estimate.

According to [28], the singular values of an analytical kernel decay exponentially (if $n_{1}=n_{2}=1$ ). In fact, in case of the Gauss kernel the eigenvalues decay even double exponentially, cf. Fig. 6.2, where the decay is the faster the larger $\sigma$ is. Since the eigenfunctions are also analytical, it holds

$$
\left\|\varphi_{\ell}\right\|_{H^{r}(0,1)} \lesssim \lambda_{\ell}^{-s} \quad \text { for any } s>0
$$



Figure 6.2. The eigenvalues of the Gauss kernel decay double exponentionally.

Therefore, it suffices to compute the eigenfunctions with accuracy $\mathcal{O}\left(h_{j}^{2}\right)$ (see [28] for the details) which leads to a quadratic rate of convergence within $\mathcal{O}\left(N \log ^{1 / 2}(N)\right)$ cost. Altogether, this shows that both approaches converge in our setting for the Gauss kernel with essentially the same rate.
6.2. Exponential kernel. Our second example is concerned with the exponential kernel

$$
k(x, y)=\exp (-|x-y|)
$$

Since $k$ is only Lipschitz continuous at the diagonal $x=y$, it follows that $k \in H^{3 / 2-\delta}((0,1) \times(0,1))$ for any $\delta>0$. According to Theorem 3.9 we therefore can essentially guarantee the rate $\operatorname{dof}_{s v d}(\varepsilon) \sim \varepsilon^{-2}$. Nonetheless, as already mentioned in Remark 3.5, the singular values decay like $\sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}} \sim \ell^{-2}$ which is faster than predicted. In addition, it turned out in our numerical tests that also the eigenfunctions $\left\{\varphi_{\ell}\right\}$ are more regular than expected, satisfying $\left\|\varphi_{\ell}\right\|_{H^{2}(0,1)} \sim \sqrt{\lambda_{\ell}} \sim \ell^{2}$. The first nine eigenfunctions are depicted in Fig. 6.4. By repeating our analysis with these settings (that is, $p=r=2$ and $n_{1}=n_{2}=1$ ) one can shows that

$$
\operatorname{dof}_{s v d}(\varepsilon) \sim \varepsilon^{-4 / 3}
$$

which is much better than predicted.


Figure 6.3. The eigenvalues of the exponential kernel (blue line) decay quadratically (indicated by the grey shadow).




Figure 6.4. The first nine eigenfunctions of the exponential kernel.


Figure 6.5. The sparse grid approximation of the exponential kernel converges essentially like $N^{-0.75}$.

On the other hand, in accordance with Theorem 4.3, the regular sparse grid approach realizes (essentially) the same rate: $\operatorname{dof}_{s g}(\varepsilon) \sim$ $\varepsilon^{-4 / 3}$. Indeed, this is validated by our computations (see Fig. 6.5).

Note here that only a regular sparse grid is involved and no locally adapted sparse grid is used, see e.g. [4] and the references therein. There, we expect a doubling of the convergence rate, i.e., essentially the rate $N^{-1.5}$. The analysis of such a nonlinear approximation scheme is however beyond of the scope of this paper.

## 7. Concluding remarks

In the present paper we compared the cost complexities of the truncated singular value decomposition and the regular sparse grid approach. We have shown that the regular sparse grid provides an efficient tool to approximate two-variate functions. Its cots complexity is at least equal to the truncated singular value decomposition. In certain situations it is even superior.

In case of the sparse grid approach we envision further improvements by the use of an optimized sparse grid and local adaptivity. Both techniques would increase the performance of the sparse grid approach.

In case of the singular value decomposition the truncation length is determined by the smoothness of the function under consideration and
is thus fixed. Therefore, improvements for the truncated singular value decomposition can only be achieved by a more efficient representation of the eigenfunctions.
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