

Some thoughts on Koopman Operators




Matthew Colbrook

15th Jan 2026



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

“To classify is to bring order into chaos.” - George Pólya




Cast of great collaborators!



Alex Townsend
(Cornell)



Igor Mezić
(UC Santa Barbara)



Alexei Stepanenko
(Cam. -> Industry)



Nicolas Boullé
(Imperial)



Gustav Conradie
(PhD student at
Cambridge)

- C., Townsend. *"Rigorous data-driven computation of spectral properties of Koopman operators for dynamical systems."* **Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics**, 2024.
- C., Mezić, Stepanenko, *"Adversarial Dynamical Systems Reveal Limits and Rules for Trustworthy Data-Driven Learning."* (under revision at **Nature Communications**).
- Boullé, C., Conradie, *"Convergent Methods for Koopman Operators on Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces."* (**SpecRKHS** - hot off the press: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.15782>)

What is a Koopman operator?

- $\mathcal{X}$ – *the state space*
- $\mathcal{X} \ni x$ – *the state*

cts $F: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ – *the dynamics*: $x_{n+1} = F(x_n)$

Henri Poincaré
(Sorbonne)



What is a Koopman operator?

- $\mathcal{X}$ – the state space
- $\mathcal{X} \ni x$ – the state


cts $F: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ – the dynamics: $x_{n+1} = F(x_n)$

- Functions $g: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ a.k.a “observables”
- Koopman operator $\mathcal{K}_F: [\mathcal{K}_F g](x) = g(F(x))$

LINEAR!

Observe g one time step forward

Bernard Koopman
(Columbia)



John von Neumann
(IAS)



- Koopman, “Hamiltonian systems and transformation in Hilbert space,” **Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA**, 1931.
- Koopman, v. Neumann, “Dynamical systems of continuous spectra,” **Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA**, 1932.

What is a Koopman operator?

- $\mathcal{X}$ – the state space
- $\mathcal{X} \ni x$ – the state
- Unknown cts $F: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ – the dynamics: $x_{n+1} = F(x_n)$
- Functions $g: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ a.k.a “observables”
- Koopman operator $\mathcal{K}_F: [\mathcal{K}_F g](x) = g(F(x))$ **LINEAR!**
- Available snapshot data: $\left\{ \left(x^{(m)}, y^{(m)} = F(x^{(m)}) \right) : m = 1, \dots, M \right\}$

Can we compute spectral properties from trajectory data?

$$g(x_n) = [\mathcal{K}^n g](x_0)$$

Why?


If $\|\mathcal{K}g - \lambda g\| \leq \varepsilon$, then $g(x_n) = [\mathcal{K}^n g](x_0) = \lambda^n g(x_0) + \mathcal{O}(n\varepsilon)$

Trades: Nonlinear, finite-dimensional $\Rightarrow$ Linear, infinite-dimensional.

$$g(x_n) = [\mathcal{K}^n g](x_0)$$

Why?

If $\|\mathcal{K}g - \lambda g\| \leq \varepsilon$, then $g(x_n) = [\mathcal{K}^n g](x_0) = \lambda^n g(x_0) + \mathcal{O}(n\varepsilon)$



Coherent features!


Lorenz attractor

Trades: Nonlinear, finite-dimensional $\Rightarrow$ Linear, infinite-dimensional.

$$g(x_n) = [\mathcal{K}^n g](x_0)$$

Why?

If $\|\mathcal{K}g - \lambda g\| \leq \varepsilon$, then $g(x_n) = [\mathcal{K}^n g](x_0) = \lambda^n g(x_0) + \mathcal{O}(n\varepsilon)$



Coherent features!

$$\text{Sp}_{\text{ap},\varepsilon}(\mathcal{K}) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \exists g, \|g\| = 1, \|\mathcal{K}g - zg\| \leq \varepsilon\}$$

Trades: Nonlinear, finite-dimensional $\Rightarrow$ Linear, infinite-dimensional.

Koopman Mode Decomposition

- Find (g_j, λ_j) with $\|\mathcal{K}g_j - \lambda_j g_j\| \leq \varepsilon$
- Expand state:

Verified Eigenfunctions

$$x \approx \sum_j c_j g_j(x)$$

coefficients, called
"Koopman modes"

- Forecasts:

$$x_n = \sum_j \lambda_j^n c_j g_j(x) + \mathcal{O}(n\varepsilon)$$

$$g(x_n) = [\mathcal{K}^n g](x_0)$$

Intuition: A nonlinear separation of variables through a linear operator!

GOAL: Compute spectral properties
and figure out how hard this is.


The Standard (naïve?) Pipeline

$$\boxed{\text{DATA}} + \boxed{\text{DISCRETIZE } \mathcal{K}}$$

The Standard (naïve?) Pipeline



The Standard (naïve?) Pipeline



The Standard (naïve?) Pipeline

DATA + DISCRETIZE $\mathcal{K}$



FINITE-DIMENSIONAL
NUMERICAL LINEAR ALGEBRA



Works great if you have a self-adjoint operator that is compact or has compact resolvent!

EIGENVALUES etc.

Eigenvalue Problems

J. Babuška*

*Institute for Physical Science and Technology
and Department of Mathematics
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742, USA*

J. Osborn**


*Department of Mathematics
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742, USA*

*Partially supported by the Office of Naval Research under contract N00014-85-K-0169 and by the National Science Foundation under grant DMS-85-16191.

**Partially supported by the National Science Foundation under grant DMS-84-10324.

HANDBOOK OF NUMERICAL ANALYSIS, VOL. II
Finite Element Methods (Part I)
Edited by P.G. Ciarlet and J.L. Lions
© 1991. Elsevier Science Publishers B.V. (North-Holland)

The Standard (naïve?) Pipeline



Perils of discretization: Warmup on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \ddots & & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & & \\ & 0 & 1 & & & \\ & & 0 & 1 & & \\ & & & 0 & 1 & \\ & & & & 0 & \ddots \\ & & & & & 0 & \ddots \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\text{Two-way infinite}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & 1 & \\ & & & \ddots & 1 \\ & & & & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$$

- Spectrum is unit circle.
- Spectrum is stable.
- Continuous spectra.
- Unitary evolution.

- Spectrum is $\{0\}$.
- Spectrum is unstable.
- Discrete spectra.
- Nilpotent evolution.

Lots of Koopman operators are built up from operators like these!

Explicit example: Matrix approximation of $\mathcal{K}$ (EDMD)

Observables $\psi_j: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, j = 1, \dots, N$

$$\{x^{(m)}, y^{(m)} = F(x^{(m)})\}_{m=1}^M$$

quadrature points

$$\langle \psi_k, \psi_j \rangle \approx \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \overline{\psi_j(x^{(m)})} \psi_k(x^{(m)}) = \left[\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \psi_1(x^{(1)}) & \dots & \psi_N(x^{(1)}) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \psi_1(x^{(M)}) & \dots & \psi_N(x^{(M)}) \end{pmatrix}}_{\Psi_X} \right]^* \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} w_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & w_M \end{pmatrix}}_W \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \psi_1(x^{(1)}) & \dots & \psi_N(x^{(1)}) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \psi_1(x^{(M)}) & \dots & \psi_N(x^{(M)}) \end{pmatrix}}_{\Psi_X} \right]_{jk}$$

quadrature weights

$$\langle \mathcal{K}\psi_k, \psi_j \rangle \approx \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \overline{\psi_j(x^{(m)})} \underbrace{\psi_k(y^{(m)})}_{[\mathcal{K}\psi_k](x^{(m)})} = \left[\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \psi_1(x^{(1)}) & \dots & \psi_N(x^{(1)}) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \psi_1(x^{(M)}) & \dots & \psi_N(x^{(M)}) \end{pmatrix}}_{\Psi_X} \right]^* \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} w_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & w_M \end{pmatrix}}_W \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \psi_1(y^{(1)}) & \dots & \psi_N(y^{(1)}) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \psi_1(y^{(M)}) & \dots & \psi_N(y^{(M)}) \end{pmatrix}}_{\Psi_Y} \right]_{jk}$$


Galerkin
Approximation

$$\mathcal{K} \rightarrow (\Psi_X^* W \Psi_X)^{-1} \Psi_X^* W \Psi_Y \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$$

- Schmid, "Dynamic mode decomposition of numerical and experimental data," **J. Fluid Mech.**, 2010.
- Rowley, Mezić, Bagheri, Schlatter, Henningson, "Spectral analysis of nonlinear flows," **J. Fluid Mech.**, 2009.
- Williams, Kevrekidis, Rowley "A data-driven approximation of the Koopman operator: Extending dynamic mode decomposition," **J. Nonlinear Sci.**, 2015.

EDMD doesn't converge!

- Duffing oscillator: $\dot{x} = y$, $\dot{y} = -\alpha y + x(1 - x^2)$, sampled $\Delta t = 0.3$.
- Gaussian radial basis functions, Monte Carlo integration ($M = 50000$)



The fix: Residual DMD (ResDMD)

$$\langle \psi_k, \psi_j \rangle \approx \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \overline{\psi_j(x^{(m)})} \psi_k(x^{(m)}) = \left[\underbrace{\Psi_X^* W \Psi_X}_G \right]_{jk}$$

$$\langle \mathcal{K}\psi_k, \psi_j \rangle \approx \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \overline{\psi_j(x^{(m)})} \underbrace{\psi_k(y^{(m)})}_{[\mathcal{K}\psi_k](x^{(m)})} = \left[\underbrace{\Psi_X^* W \Psi_Y}_{K_1} \right]_{jk}$$


- C., Townsend, “Rigorous data-driven computation of spectral properties of Koopman operators for dynamical systems,” **Commun. Pure Appl. Math.**, 2023.
- C., Ayton, Szóke, “Residual Dynamic Mode Decomposition,” **J. Fluid Mech.**, 2023.
- Code: <https://github.com/MColbrook/Residual-Dynamic-Mode-Decomposition>

The fix: Residual DMD (ResDMD)

$$\langle \psi_k, \psi_j \rangle \approx \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \overline{\psi_j(x^{(m)})} \psi_k(x^{(m)}) = \left[\underbrace{\Psi_X^* W \Psi_X}_G \right]_{jk}$$

$$\langle \mathcal{K}\psi_k, \psi_j \rangle \approx \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \overline{\psi_j(x^{(m)})} \underbrace{\psi_k(y^{(m)})}_{[\mathcal{K}\psi_k](x^{(m)})} = \left[\underbrace{\Psi_X^* W \Psi_Y}_{K_1} \right]_{jk}$$

adjoint

- C., Townsend, “Rigorous data-driven computation of spectral properties of Koopman operators for dynamical systems,” **Commun. Pure Appl. Math.**, 2023.
- C., Ayton, Szóke, “Residual Dynamic Mode Decomposition,” **J. Fluid Mech.**, 2023.
- Code: <https://github.com/MColbrook/Residual-Dynamic-Mode-Decomposition>

The fix: Residual DMD (ResDMD)

$$\langle \psi_k, \psi_j \rangle \approx \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \overline{\psi_j(x^{(m)})} \psi_k(x^{(m)}) = \left[\underbrace{\Psi_X^* W \Psi_X}_G \right]_{jk}$$

$$\langle \mathcal{K}\psi_k, \psi_j \rangle \approx \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \overline{\psi_j(x^{(m)})} \underbrace{\psi_k(y^{(m)})}_{[\mathcal{K}\psi_k](x^{(m)})} = \left[\underbrace{\Psi_X^* W \Psi_Y}_{K_1} \right]_{jk}$$

$$\langle \mathcal{K}\psi_k, \mathcal{K}\psi_j \rangle \approx \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \overline{\psi_j(y^{(m)})} \psi_k(y^{(m)}) = \left[\underbrace{\Psi_Y^* W \Psi_Y}_{K_2} \right]_{jk}$$



- C., Townsend, “Rigorous data-driven computation of spectral properties of Koopman operators for dynamical systems,” **Commun. Pure Appl. Math.**, 2023.
- C., Ayton, Szóke, “Residual Dynamic Mode Decomposition,” **J. Fluid Mech.**, 2023.
- Code: <https://github.com/MColbrook/Residual-Dynamic-Mode-Decomposition>

The fix: Residual DMD (ResDMD)

$$\langle \psi_k, \psi_j \rangle \approx \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \overline{\psi_j(x^{(m)})} \psi_k(x^{(m)}) = \left[\underbrace{\Psi_X^* W \Psi_X}_G \right]_{jk}$$

$$\langle \mathcal{K}\psi_k, \psi_j \rangle \approx \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \overline{\psi_j(x^{(m)})} \underbrace{\psi_k(y^{(m)})}_{[\mathcal{K}\psi_k](x^{(m)})} = \left[\underbrace{\Psi_X^* W \Psi_Y}_{K_1} \right]_{jk}$$

$$\langle \mathcal{K}\psi_k, \mathcal{K}\psi_j \rangle \approx \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \overline{\psi_j(y^{(m)})} \psi_k(y^{(m)}) = \left[\underbrace{\Psi_Y^* W \Psi_Y}_{K_2} \right]_{jk}$$

Residuals: $g = \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{g}_j \psi_j$, $\|\mathcal{K}g - \lambda g\|^2 = \langle \mathcal{K}g - \lambda g, \mathcal{K}g - \lambda g \rangle$

- C., Townsend, “Rigorous data-driven computation of spectral properties of Koopman operators for dynamical systems,” **Commun. Pure Appl. Math.**, 2023.
- C., Ayton, Szóke, “Residual Dynamic Mode Decomposition,” **J. Fluid Mech.**, 2023.
- Code: <https://github.com/MColbrook/Residual-Dynamic-Mode-Decomposition>

The fix: Residual DMD (ResDMD)

$$\langle \psi_k, \psi_j \rangle \approx \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \overline{\psi_j(x^{(m)})} \psi_k(x^{(m)}) = \left[\underbrace{\Psi_X^* W \Psi_X}_G \right]_{jk}$$

$$\langle \mathcal{K}\psi_k, \psi_j \rangle \approx \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \overline{\psi_j(x^{(m)})} \underbrace{\psi_k(y^{(m)})}_{[\mathcal{K}\psi_k](x^{(m)})} = \left[\underbrace{\Psi_X^* W \Psi_Y}_{K_1} \right]_{jk}$$

$$\langle \mathcal{K}\psi_k, \mathcal{K}\psi_j \rangle \approx \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \overline{\psi_j(y^{(m)})} \psi_k(y^{(m)}) = \left[\underbrace{\Psi_Y^* W \Psi_Y}_{K_2} \right]_{jk}$$

Residuals: $g = \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{g}_j \psi_j$, $\|\mathcal{K}g - \lambda g\|^2 = \sum_{k,j=1}^N \mathbf{g}_k \overline{\mathbf{g}_j} \langle \mathcal{K}\psi_k - \lambda \psi_k, \mathcal{K}\psi_j - \lambda \psi_j \rangle$


- C., Townsend, “Rigorous data-driven computation of spectral properties of Koopman operators for dynamical systems,” **Commun. Pure Appl. Math.**, 2023.
- C., Ayton, Szóke, “Residual Dynamic Mode Decomposition,” **J. Fluid Mech.**, 2023.
- Code: <https://github.com/MColbrook/Residual-Dynamic-Mode-Decomposition>

The fix: Residual DMD (ResDMD)

$$\langle \psi_k, \psi_j \rangle \approx \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \overline{\psi_j(x^{(m)})} \psi_k(x^{(m)}) = \left[\underbrace{\Psi_X^* W \Psi_X}_G \right]_{jk}$$

$$\langle \mathcal{K}\psi_k, \psi_j \rangle \approx \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \overline{\psi_j(x^{(m)})} \underbrace{\psi_k(y^{(m)})}_{[\mathcal{K}\psi_k](x^{(m)})} = \left[\underbrace{\Psi_X^* W \Psi_Y}_{K_1} \right]_{jk}$$

$$\langle \mathcal{K}\psi_k, \mathcal{K}\psi_j \rangle \approx \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \overline{\psi_j(y^{(m)})} \psi_k(y^{(m)}) = \left[\underbrace{\Psi_Y^* W \Psi_Y}_{K_2} \right]_{jk}$$




Residuals: $g = \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{g}_j \psi_j$, $\|\mathcal{K}g - \lambda g\|^2 = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{g}^* [K_2 - \lambda K_1^* - \bar{\lambda} K_1 + |\lambda|^2 G] \mathbf{g}$


- C., Townsend, “Rigorous data-driven computation of spectral properties of Koopman operators for dynamical systems,” **Commun. Pure Appl. Math.**, 2023.
- C., Ayton, Szóke, “Residual Dynamic Mode Decomposition,” **J. Fluid Mech.**, 2023.
- Code: <https://github.com/MColbrook/Residual-Dynamic-Mode-Decomposition>

ResDMD does converge!

- Duffing oscillator: $\dot{x} = y$, $\dot{y} = -\alpha y + x(1 - x^2)$, sampled $\Delta t = 0.3$.
- Gaussian radial basis functions, Monte Carlo integration ($M = 50000$)

Compute $\text{Sp}_{\text{ap},\varepsilon}(\mathcal{K})$, local adaptive control on $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$





What can we do?

Consider space of observables with finite energy: $L^2(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$

Theorem: There **exists** algorithms $\Gamma_{N,M}$ using snapshots such that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_{N,M}(F) = \text{Sp}_{\text{ap},\varepsilon}(\mathcal{K}_F)$$

for all systems.



N = size of basis, M = amount of data (quadrature)

$$\text{Sp}_{\text{ap},\varepsilon}(\mathcal{K}) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \exists g, \|g\| = 1, \|\mathcal{K}g - zg\| \leq \varepsilon\}$$

What can we do?

Consider space of observables with finite energy: $L^2(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$

Theorem: There **exists** algorithms $\Gamma_{N,M}$ using snapshots such that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_{N,M}(F) = \text{Sp}_{\text{ap},\varepsilon}(\mathcal{K}_F)$$

for all systems.

N = size of basis, M = amount of data (quadrature)

Double limit $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty}$

Can we do better?

Adversaries: Double limit is necessary!

Implies $\mathcal{K}$ is unitary

Class of systems: $\Omega_{\mathbb{D}} = \{F: \bar{\mathbb{D}} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{D}} \mid F \text{ cts, measure preserving, invertible}\}.$

Data an algorithm can use: $\mathcal{T}_F = \{(x, y_m) \mid x \in \bar{\mathbb{D}}, \|F(x) - y_m\| \leq 2^{-m}\}.$

Theorem: There **does not exist** any sequence of deterministic algorithms $\{\Gamma_n\}$ using $\mathcal{T}_F$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_n(F) = \text{Sp}_{\text{ap}, \varepsilon}(\mathcal{K}_F) \forall F \in \Omega_{\mathbb{D}}.$

NB:

- n can index anything.
- Universal - any type of algorithm or computational model.
- Similarly, no random algorithms converging with probability $> 1/2$.

Proof idea: Constructing an adversary

$$F_0: \text{rotation by } \pi, \operatorname{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_{F_0}) = \{\pm 1\}$$

Phase transition lemma: Let $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}, Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_N\}$ be distinct points in annulus $\mathcal{A} = \{x \in \mathbb{D} \mid 0 < R < \|x\| < r < 1\}$ with $X \cap Y = \emptyset$. There exists a measure-preserving homeomorphism H such that H acts as the identity on $\mathbb{D} \setminus \mathcal{A}$ and $H(y_j) = F_0(H(x_j)), j = 1, \dots, N$.

Conjugacy of data ($x_j \rightarrow y_j$) with F_0

Idea: Use lemma to trick any algorithm into oscillating between spectra.

Proof idea: Constructing an adversary

Suppose (for contradiction) $\{\Gamma_n\}$ uses $\mathcal{T}_F$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_n(F) = \text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_F) \quad \forall F \in \Omega_{\mathbb{D}}$.

Build an **adversarial** F ...

$$\mathcal{T}_F = \{(x, y_m) \mid \|F(x) - y_m\| \leq 2^{-m}\}$$


Proof idea: Constructing an adversary

Suppose (for contradiction) $\{\Gamma_n\}$ uses $\mathcal{T}_F$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_n(F) = \text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_F) \quad \forall F \in \Omega_{\mathbb{D}}$.

Build an **adversarial** F ...

$$\widetilde{F}_1(r, \theta) = (r, \theta + \pi + \phi(r)), \text{ supp}(\phi) \subset [1/4, 3/4]$$

$$\text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_{\widetilde{F}_1}) = \mathbb{T} \text{ (unit circle).}$$



$$\mathcal{T}_F = \{(x, y_m) \mid \|F(x) - y_m\| \leq 2^{-m}\}$$

Proof idea: Constructing an adversary

Suppose (for contradiction) $\{\Gamma_n\}$ uses $\mathcal{T}_F$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_n(F) = \text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_F) \quad \forall F \in \Omega_{\mathbb{D}}$.

Build an **adversarial** F ...


$$\widetilde{F}_1(r, \theta) = (r, \theta + \pi + \phi(r)), \text{supp}(\phi) \subset [1/4, 3/4]$$

$$\text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_{\widetilde{F}_1}) = \mathbb{T} \text{ (unit circle).}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_n(\widetilde{F}_1) = \text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_{\widetilde{F}_1}) \Rightarrow \exists n_1 \text{ s.t. } \text{dist}(i, \Gamma_{n_1}(\widetilde{F}_1)) \leq 1.$$

BUT Γ_{n_1} uses finite amount of info to output $\Gamma_{n_1}(\widetilde{F}_1)$.

Let X, Y correspond to these snapshots.



$$\mathcal{T}_F = \{(x, y_m) \mid \|F(x) - y_m\| \leq 2^{-m}\}$$

Proof idea: Constructing an adversary

Suppose (for contradiction) $\{\Gamma_n\}$ uses $\mathcal{T}_F$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_n(F) = \text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_F) \quad \forall F \in \Omega_{\mathbb{D}}$.

Build an **adversarial** F ...

$$\widetilde{F}_1(r, \theta) = (r, \theta + \pi + \phi(r)), \text{supp}(\phi) \subset [1/4, 3/4]$$

$$\text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_{\widetilde{F}_1}) = \mathbb{T} \text{ (unit circle).}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_n(\widetilde{F}_1) = \text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_{\widetilde{F}_1}) \Rightarrow \exists n_1 \text{ s.t. } \text{dist}(i, \Gamma_{n_1}(\widetilde{F}_1)) \leq 1.$$


BUT Γ_{n_1} uses finite amount of info to output $\Gamma_{n_1}(\widetilde{F}_1)$.

Let X, Y correspond to these snapshots.

Lemma: $F_1 = H_1^{-1} \circ F_0 \circ H_1$ on annulus $\mathcal{A}_1$.

Consistent data $\Rightarrow \Gamma_{n_1}(F_1) = \Gamma_{n_1}(\widetilde{F}_1)$, $\text{dist}(i, \Gamma_{n_1}(F_1)) \leq 1$

BUT $\text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_{F_1}) = \text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_{F_0}) = \{\pm 1\}$




Proof idea: Constructing an adversary

Inductive step: Repeat on annuli, $F_k = H_k^{-1} \circ F_0 \circ H_k$ on $\mathcal{A}_k$. $F = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F_k$

Consistent data $\Rightarrow \Gamma_{n_k}(F) = \Gamma_{n_k}(\widetilde{F_k})$, $\text{dist}(i, \Gamma_{n_k}(F)) \leq 1$, $n_k \rightarrow \infty$

BUT $\text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_F) = \text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_{F_0}) = \{\pm 1\}$

CANNOT CONVERGE



Cascade of disks


Proof idea: Constructing an adversary

Inductive step: Repeat on annuli, $F_k = H_k^{-1} \circ F_0 \circ H_k$ on $\mathcal{A}_k$. $F = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F_k$

Consistent data $\Rightarrow \Gamma_{n_k}(F) = \Gamma_{n_k}(\widetilde{F}_k)$, $\text{dist}(i, \Gamma_{n_k}(F)) \leq 1$, $n_k \rightarrow \infty$

BUT $\text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_F) = \text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_{F_0}) = \{\pm 1\}$

CANNOT CONVERGE



Classifications: *Solvability Complexity Index (SCI)*

SCI: Fewest number of limits needed to solve a computational problem.

- Δ_1 : One limit, full error control. E.g., $d(\Gamma_n(F), \text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_F)) \leq 2^{-n}$.
- Δ_{m+1} : $\text{SCI} \leq m$.
- Σ_m : $\text{SCI} \leq m$, final limit from below.

$$\text{E.g., } \Sigma_1: \sup_{z \in \Gamma_n(F)} \text{dist}(z, \text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_F)) \leq 2^{-n}.$$

- Π_m : $\text{SCI} \leq m$, final limit from above.

$$\text{E.g., } \Pi_1: \sup_{z \in \text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_F)} \text{dist}(z, \Gamma_n(F)) \leq 2^{-n}.$$

-
- Hansen, "On the solvability complexity index, the n-pseudospectrum and approximations of spectra of operators." **J. Am. Math. Soc.**, 2011.
 - C., "The foundations of infinite-dimensional spectral computations," **PhD diss.**, University of Cambridge, 2020.
 - C., Hansen, "The foundations of spectral computations via the solvability complexity index hierarchy," **J. Eur. Math. Soc.**, 2022.
 - C., Antun, Hansen, "The difficulty of computing stable and accurate neural networks," **Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA**, 2022.
 - Ben-Artzi, C., Hansen, Nevanlinna, Seidel, "On the solvability complexity index hierarchy and towers of algorithms," arXiv, 2020.

Classifications: *Solvability Complexity Index (SCI)*

SCI: Fewest number of limits needed to solve a computational problem.

- Δ_1 : One limit, full error control. E.g., $d(\Gamma_n(F), \text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_F)) \leq 2^{-n}$.
- Δ_{m+1} : $\text{SCI} \leq m$.
- Σ_m : $\text{SCI} \leq m$, final limit from below.

$$\text{E.g., } \Sigma_1: \sup_{z \in \Gamma_n(F)} \text{dist}(z, \text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_F)) \leq 2^{-n}.$$

- Π_m : $\text{SCI} \leq m$, final limit from above.

$$\text{E.g., } \Pi_1: \sup_{z \in \text{Sp}(\mathcal{K}_F)} \text{dist}(z, \Gamma_n(F)) \leq 2^{-n}.$$

trust output

verification

covers spectrum

- Hansen, "On the solvability complexity index, the n-pseudospectrum and approximations of spectra of operators." **J. Am. Math. Soc.**, 2011.
- C., "The foundations of infinite-dimensional spectral computations," **PhD diss.**, University of Cambridge, 2020.
- C., Hansen, "The foundations of spectral computations via the solvability complexity index hierarchy," **J. Eur. Math. Soc.**, 2022.
- C., Antun, Hansen, "The difficulty of computing stable and accurate neural networks," **Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA**, 2022.
- Ben-Artzi, C., Hansen, Nevanlinna, Seidel, "On the solvability complexity index hierarchy and towers of algorithms," arXiv, 2020.

Lots of SCI upper bounds lurking in Koopman literature!

SCI: Fewest number of limits needed to solve a computational problem.

Algorithm	Comments/Assumptions	Spectral Problem's Corresponding SCI Upper Bound			
		<i>KMD</i>	<i>Spectrum</i>	<i>Spectral Measure (if m.p.)</i>	<i>Spectral Type (if m.p.)</i>
Extended DMD [47]	general L^2 spaces	$\text{SCI} \leq 2^*$	N/C	N/C	n/a
Residual DMD [44]	general L^2 spaces	$\text{SCI} \leq 2^*$	$\text{SCI} \leq 3^*$	$\text{SCI} \leq 2^*$	varies, see [84] e.g., a.c. density: $\text{SCI} \leq 2^*$
Measure-preserving EDMD [45]	m.p. systems	$\text{SCI} \leq 1$	N/C	$\text{SCI} \leq 2^*$ (general) $\text{SCI} \leq 1$ (delay-embedding)	n/a
Hankel DMD [85]	m.p. ergodic systems	$\text{SCI} \leq 2^*$	N/C	N/C	n/a
Periodic approximations [86]	m.p. + ω a.c.	$\text{SCI} \leq 2$	N/C	$\text{SCI} \leq 2$ (see [87])	a.c. density: $\text{SCI} \leq 3$
Christoffel–Darboux kernel [40]	m.p. ergodic systems	$\text{SCI} \leq 3$	n/a	$\text{SCI} \leq 2$	e.g., a.c. density: $\text{SCI} \leq 2$
Generator EDMD [88]	cts.-time, samples ∇F (otherwise additional limit)	$\text{SCI} \leq 2$	N/C	$\text{SCI} \leq 2$ (see [89])	n/a
Compactification [42]	cts.-time, m.p. ergodic systems	$\text{SCI} \leq 4$	N/C	$\text{SCI} \leq 4$	n/a
Resolvent compactification [43]	cts.-time, m.p. ergodic systems	$\text{SCI} \leq 5$	N/C	$\text{SCI} \leq 5$	n/a
Diffusion maps [90] (see also [10])	cts.-time, m.p. ergodic systems	$\text{SCI} \leq 3$	n/a	n/a	n/a

Are these sharp?


Previous techniques prove upper bounds on SCI.

“N/C”: method need not converge. “n/a”: algorithm not applicable to problem.

Also in Ulam’s method for Markov processes, SRB measure computation, control,...

Classification for Koopman

3 limits needed in general!



Different classes:

$$\Omega_X = \{F: X \rightarrow X \mid F \text{ cts}\}$$

$$\Omega_X^m = \{F: X \rightarrow X \mid F \text{ cts, m. p.}\}$$

$$\Omega_X^\alpha = \{F: X \rightarrow X \mid F \text{ mod. cty. } \alpha\}$$

$$[d_X(F(x), F(y)) \leq \alpha(d_X(x, y))]$$

Optimal algorithms and classifications of dynamical systems.

Peter Lax:

“The trick of the successful mathematician is to turn the question being asked into one he knows how to answer.”

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe:

“Mathematicians are like Frenchmen: whatever you say to them they translate into their own language and forthwith it is something entirely different.”

Let's perform this trick by changing the space...

Reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS)


Hilbert space of functions on $\mathcal{X}$ s.t. $g \mapsto g(x)$ bounded $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Generated by a kernel $\mathfrak{K}: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$

$$g(x) = \langle g, \mathfrak{K}_x \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{K}(x, y) = \langle \mathfrak{K}_x, \mathfrak{K}_y \rangle = \mathfrak{K}_x(y)$$

Advantages over $L^2(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$:

- Forecasts: space bounds $\Rightarrow$ pointwise bounds.
- High-dimensional systems practical through kernel trick.
- Fast methods for evaluating $\mathfrak{K}$.
- Different $\mathfrak{K} \Rightarrow$ different $\mathcal{K}$! Can be tailored to application.
(This is where the community is currently heading.)
- Leads to fundamental “possibility” gains...



Reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS)


Hilbert space of functions on $\mathcal{X}$ s.t. $g \mapsto g(x)$ bounded $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Generated by a kernel $\mathfrak{K}: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$

$$g(x) = \langle g, \mathfrak{K}_x \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{K}(x, y) = \langle \mathfrak{K}_x, \mathfrak{K}_y \rangle = \mathfrak{K}_x(y)$$

Advantages over $L^2(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$:

- Forecasts: space bounds $\Rightarrow$ pointwise bounds.
- High-dimensional systems practical through kernel trick.
- Fast methods for evaluating $\mathfrak{K}$.
- Different $\mathfrak{K} \Rightarrow$ different $\mathcal{K}$! Can be tailored to application.
(This is where the community is currently heading.)
- Leads to fundamental “possibility” gains...



SpecRKHS: Avoiding large data limit $M \rightarrow \infty$

Look at “Left eigenpairs” through $\mathcal{K}^*$:

$$\mathcal{K}^* \mathfrak{K}_x = \mathfrak{K}_{F(x)}$$

Evolution of functionals.

$$g(x) = \langle g, \mathfrak{K}_x \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$$

No quadrature needed:

$$G_{jk} = \langle \mathfrak{K}_{x^{(k)}}, \mathfrak{K}_{x^{(j)}} \rangle = \mathfrak{K}(x^{(k)}, x^{(j)})$$

$$A_{jk} = \langle \mathcal{K}^* \mathfrak{K}_{x^{(k)}}, \mathfrak{K}_{x^{(j)}} \rangle = \langle \mathfrak{K}_{y^{(k)}}, \mathfrak{K}_{x^{(j)}} \rangle = \mathfrak{K}(y^{(k)}, x^{(j)})$$

$$R_{jk} = \langle \mathcal{K}^* \mathfrak{K}_{x^{(k)}}, \mathcal{K}^* \mathfrak{K}_{x^{(j)}} \rangle = \langle \mathfrak{K}_{y^{(k)}}, \mathfrak{K}_{y^{(j)}} \rangle = \mathfrak{K}(y^{(k)}, y^{(j)})$$

$$g = \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{g}_m \mathfrak{K}_{x^{(m)}}, \quad \|\mathcal{K}^* g - \lambda g\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \mathbf{g}^* (R - \lambda A^* - \bar{\lambda} A + G) \mathbf{g}$$

SpecRKHS: Example algorithm

$$\text{res}^*(\lambda, \mathbf{g})^2 = \frac{\|\mathcal{K}^* g - \lambda g\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2}{\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2} = \frac{\mathbf{g}^* [R - \lambda A^* - \bar{\lambda} A + G] \mathbf{g}}{\mathbf{g}^* G \mathbf{g}}$$

1. Compute $G, A, R \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ ($N = M$)
2. For z_k in grid, compute $\tau_k = \min_{g = \sum_{m=1}^N \mathbf{g}_m \mathfrak{K}_{x(m)}}$ $\text{res}^*(z_k, \mathbf{g})$, corresponding g_k (gen. SVD).
3. **Output:** $\{z_k: \tau_k < \varepsilon\}, \{g_k: \tau_k < \varepsilon\}$ (ε -pseudoeigenfunctions).

First convergent method for general $\mathcal{K}$

Theorem:

- **Error control:** $\{z_k: \tau_k < \varepsilon\} \subseteq \text{Sp}_{\text{ap}, \varepsilon}(\mathcal{K}^*)$
- **Convergence:** Converges locally uniformly to $\text{Sp}_{\text{ap}, \varepsilon}(\mathcal{K}^*)$ (as $N \rightarrow \infty$)

$$\text{Sp}_{\text{ap}, \varepsilon}(\mathcal{K}^*) = \{z \in \mathbb{C}: \exists g, \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 1, \|\mathcal{K}^* g - z g\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \varepsilon\}$$

Practical gains: Sea ice forecasting




Satellite data




Motivation: Arctic amplification, polar bears, local communities, effect on extreme weather in Northern hemisphere,...

Problems:


1. Very hard to locate geographical significant regions.
2. Very hard to predict more than two months in advance.



Avoid spurious evals $\Rightarrow$ State-of-the-art forecasts




Relative mean squared error over 2016-2020. Model built from 2005-2015 data. (Solid lines moving 12-month mean.)




Mean binary accuracy over test years 2012-2020. (*IceNet: Andersson et al, "Seasonal Arctic sea ice forecasting with probabilistic deep learning." Nature Communications, 2021.*)

Optimal algorithms and classifications of systems


49




Optimal algorithms and classifications of systems



Optimal algorithms and classifications of systems



Optimal algorithms and classifications of systems



Pointers

1. Data-driven spectral problems for Koopman operators are hugely popular.
BUT: Standard truncation methods often fail.
2. **General method with convergence for spectral properties**
 (spectra, pseudospectra, spectral measures etc.) of K. operators!
E.g., Verification of approximate eigenfunctions leads to practical gains.
3. **SCI hierarchy** classifies computational problems:
Lower bounds through method of adversarial dynamics.
Upper bounds $\Rightarrow$ new “inf.-dim.” algorithms. Rigorous, optimal, practical.
 $\rightarrow$ We now have a near complete picture for Koopman on $L^2(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$ and RKHS!
NB: *Similar picture has emerged for spectral measures, dealing with continuous spectra (versus eigenvalues) and spectral type (different flavors of dynamics).*

Shameless plug...

Upcoming book with CUP:

INFINITE-DIMENSIONAL SPECTRAL COMPUTATIONS

Foundations, Algorithms, and Modern
Applications

Matthew j. Colbrook

100s of: classifications, algorithms,
examples (webpage: full code), figures,
exercises (webpage: full solutions).

****Out in August 2026****

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	vi
<i>Notation</i>	xiv
<i>Example Classifications</i>	xvi
<i>Flowchart</i>	xvii
1 Spectral Problems in Infinite Dimensions	1
2 The Solvability Complexity Index: A Toolkit for Classifying Problems	43
3 Computing Spectra with Error Control	77
4 Spectral Measures of Self-Adjoint Operators	159
5 Spectral Measures of Unitary Operators	231
6 Spectral Types of Self-Adjoint and Unitary Operators	276
7 Quantifying the Size of Spectra	310
8 Essential Spectra	367
9 Spectral Radii, Abscissas, and Gaps	407
10 Nonlinear Spectral Problems	438
11 Data-Driven Koopman Spectral Problems for Nonlinear Dynamical Systems	493
<i>Appendix A</i> Some brief preliminaries	582
<i>Appendix B</i> A bluffer's guide to the SCI hierarchy	588
<i>Bibliography</i>	590
<i>Index</i>	648

References

- [1] Colbrook, Matthew J., and Alex Townsend. "Rigorous data-driven computation of spectral properties of Koopman operators for dynamical systems." *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 77.1 (2024): 221-283.
- [2] Colbrook, Matthew J., Loma J. Ayton, and Máté Szőke. "Residual dynamic mode decomposition: robust and verified Koopmanism." *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 955 (2023): A21.
- [3] Colbrook, M. J., Li, Q., Raut, R. V., & Townsend, A. "Beyond expectations: residual dynamic mode decomposition and variance for stochastic dynamical systems." *Nonlinear Dynamics* 112.3 (2024): 2037-2061.
- [4] Colbrook, Matthew J. "The Multiverse of Dynamic Mode Decomposition Algorithms." *Handbook of Numerical Analysis*, vol. 25, pp. 127-230. Elsevier, 2024..
- [5] Colbrook, Matthew J. "The mpEDMD algorithm for data-driven computations of measure-preserving dynamical systems." *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 61.3 (2023): 1585-1608.
- [6] Colbrook, Matthew J., Catherine Drysdale, and Andrew Horning. "Rigged Dynamic Mode Decomposition: Data-Driven Generalized Eigenfunction Decompositions for Koopman Operators." *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems* 24, no. 2 (2025): 1150-1190.
- [7] Boullé, Nicolas, and Matthew J. Colbrook. "Multiplicative Dynamic Mode Decomposition." *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems* 24, no. 2 (2025): 1945-1968.
- [8] Boullé, Nicolas and Matthew J. Colbrook, "On the Convergence of Hermitian Dynamic Mode Decomposition" *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 472 (2025).
- [9] Colbrook, Matthew J., Andrew Horning, and Tianyiwa Xie. "Computing Generalized Eigenfunctions in Rigged Hilbert Spaces." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.08343* (2024).
- [10] Zagli, Niccolò, et al. "Bridging the Gap between Koopmanism and Response Theory: Using Natural Variability to Predict Forced Response." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.01622* (2024).
- [11] Colbrook, Matthew J. "Another look at Residual Dynamic Mode Decomposition in the regime of fewer Snapshots than Dictionary Size." *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* 469 (2024).
- [12] Colbrook, Matthew. "The foundations of infinite-dimensional spectral computations." *Diss. University of Cambridge*, 2020.
- [13] Ben-Artzi, J., Colbrook, M. J., Hansen, A. C., Nevanlinna, O., & Seidel, M. (2020). "Computing Spectra—On the Solvability Complexity Index Hierarchy and Towers of Algorithms." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.03280*.
- [14] Colbrook, Matthew J., Vegard Antun, and Anders C. Hansen. "The difficulty of computing stable and accurate neural networks: On the barriers of deep learning and Smale's 18th problem." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 119.12 (2022): e2107151119.
- [15] Colbrook, Matthew, Andrew Horning, and Alex Townsend. "Computing spectral measures of self-adjoint operators." *SIAM review* 63.3 (2021): 489-524.
- [16] Colbrook, Matthew J., Bogdan Roman, and Anders C. Hansen. "How to compute spectra with error control." *Physical Review Letters* 122.25 (2019): 250201.
- [17] Colbrook, Matthew J., and Anders C. Hansen. "The foundations of spectral computations via the solvability complexity index hierarchy." *Journal of the European Mathematical Society* (2022).
- [18] Colbrook, Matthew J. "Computing spectral measures and spectral types." *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 384 (2021): 433-501.
- [19] Colbrook, Matthew J., and Anders C. Hansen. "On the infinite-dimensional QR algorithm." *Numerische Mathematik* 143 (2019): 17-83.
- [20] Colbrook, Matthew J. "On the computation of geometric features of spectra of linear operators on Hilbert spaces." *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* (2022): 1-82.
- [21] Brunton, Steven L., and Matthew J. Colbrook. "Resilient Data-driven Dynamical Systems with Koopman: An Infinite-dimensional Numerical Analysis Perspective."
- [22] Colbrook, Matthew J., Igor Mezić, and Alexei Stepanenko. "Limits and Powers of Koopman Learning." *arXiv preprint arxiv:2407.06312* (2024).
- [23] Herwig, April, Matthew J. Colbrook, Oliver Junge, Péter Koltai, and Julia Slipantschuk. "Avoiding spectral pollution for transfer operators using residuals." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.16915* (2025).
- [24] Boullé, Nicolas, Matthew J. Colbrook, and Gustav Conradie. "Convergent Methods for Koopman Operators on Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.15782* (2025).