An algorithm for computing scattering poles based on dual characterization to interior eigenvalues

Fioralba Cakoni[*] Houssem Haddar [†] and Dana Zilberberg [‡]

Abstract

We present an algorithm for the computation of scattering poles for an impenetrable obstacle with Dirichlet or Robin boundary conditions in acoustic scattering. This paper is a follow-up to the work of F. Cakoni, D. Colton, and H. Haddar, titled 'A duality between scattering poles and transmission eigenvalues in scattering theory' (Proc. A. 476, 2020), where the authors developed a conceptually unified approach for characterizing the scattering poles and interior eigenvalues corresponding to a scattering problem. This approach views scattering poles as dual to interior eigenvalues by interchanging the roles of incident and scattered fields. In this framework, both sets are related to the kernel of the relative scattering operator mapping incident fields to scattered fields. This corresponds to the exterior scattering problem for the interior eigenvalues and the interior scattering problem for scattering poles. Based on this dual characterization and motivated by the generalized linear sampling method for computing the interior eigenvalues, we present a new numerical algorithm for computing scattering poles that does not use an iterative scheme. Preliminary numerical examples demonstrate the viability of this computational approach.

Key words: inverse scattering, obstacle scattering, impedance obstacle, scattering poles, resonances.
AMS subject classifications: 35R30, 35J25, 35P25, 35P05

1   Introduction

The theory of scattering poles, also referred to as resonances, constitutes a rich and beautiful aspect of scattering theory. For an extensive exploration of the subject, we direct the reader to the monograph [7]. The concept of scattering poles is inherently dynamic, as it captures physical information about waves by associating the rate of oscillations with the real part of a pole and the rate of decay with its imaginary part. However, an elegant mathematical

---

[*]Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA (fc292@math.rutgers.edu)

[†]INRIA, UMA, ENSTA Paris, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, Palaiseau, France (Houssem.Haddar@inria.fr)

[‡]Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA (dana.zilberberg@gmail.com)

formulation arises when considering them as the poles of the meromorphic extension of the scattering operator [12, 19]. For a broad class of scattering problems, it is known that scattering poles exist and are complex with negative imaginary parts. Various properties of scattering poles, such as estimates of their density and bounds for obstacle scattering or inhomogeneous media, including dissipative systems, can be found in the literature (see, for example, [6, 14, 16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27]; this list is by no means exclusive). Numerical methods for computing scattering poles have also been proposed in the literature (see, e.g., [8, 13, 26] and references therein). Scattering poles have been proposed as a tool for solving the inverse scattering problem, and radar identification often relies on the study of these resonant frequencies [22]. Uniqueness and stability results for recovering impenetrable obstacles from knowledge of scattering poles have been proven, as seen in [16, 17]. However, a practical challenge associated with inverse scattering is the difficulty in measuring the scattering poles due to their being complex.

At a scattering pole, there is a non-zero scattered field in the absence of the incident field. This property precisely enables the capturing of scattering poles as an eigenvalue problem. On the flip side of this characterization of scattering poles, one might inquire whether there are frequencies for which an incident field exists that does not scatter due to the scattering object. The answer to this question leads to an interior eigenvalue problem associated with the support of the scatterer. In the case of scattering by a bounded impenetrable obstacle, such as with Dirichlet boundary conditions, this is simply the Dirichlet eigenvalue problem for a symmetric elliptic operator. A more intriguing situation arises in the scattering by an inhomogeneous medium where a new eigenvalue problem emerges, referred to as the transmission eigenvalue problem [3]. This is a non-selfadjoint eigenvalue problem formulated in the support of inhomogeneity for two homogeneous elliptic partial differential equations sharing the same Cauchy data. Exploiting mathematically the fact that at an interior eigenvalue there are normalized incident fields that produce arbitrarily small scattered fields, it is possible to show that the interior eigenvalues can be determined from the (measured) relative scattering operator corresponding to the physical scattering experiment [2, 3, 10]. This analysis has led to computable algorithms for determining the interior eigenvalues by the Generalized Linear Sampling Method (GLSM) in inverse scattering theory [1, 3]. In order to transfer these techniques to the computation of scattering poles, the authors in [4] introduced a duality argument between scattering poles and interior eigenvalues for a Dirichlet obstacle and an inhomogeneous medium of bounded support. In particular, the scattering poles are studied in connection with the kernel of an operator that plays the same role as the relative scattering operator in relation to the Dirichlet eigenvalues and transmission eigenvalues, respectively. This duality is revealed by flipping the roles of interior and exterior domains and has led to a new way of defining the scattering poles. However, [4] fell short of turning this new characterization into a computable algorithm. Our current paper can be seen as a continuation of [4], with the main goal being to develop and implement an algorithm for computing the scattering poles based on this dual characterization using the GLSM.

Our paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we summarize the analytical results obtained in [4] regarding the duality between the scattering poles for a Dirichlet obstacle and the corresponding Dirichlet eigenvalues. Based on these results, we derive the Generalized Linear Sampling Method (GLSM), leading to an implementable algorithm for computing

the scattering poles. We then outline a particular implementation procedure in the two-dimensional case. In Section 3, we develop the theory for the duality of the scattering poles for an impedance obstacle (also known as an obstacle with Robin boundary condition) and the corresponding impedance eigenvalues. This aspect was not included in [4], and here in addition we provide a GLSM computational algorithm. The Robin boundary condition model the scattering by an impenetrable scatterer coated with a thin layer of lossy and/or dispersive material. Section 4 presents a preliminary numerical study. Although not included here, our algorithm can be used to compute the scattering poles for an inhomogeneous medium of bounded support (possibly absorbing and dispersive) based on the analysis developed in [4]. We emphasize that our algorithm for computing the scattering poles is universal for any physical scattering problem involving bounded scatterers, provided that the interior scattering operator is given. To compute the interior scattering operator, one utilizes the model governing the scattering phenomenon through the solution of the interior scattering problem. Speculatively, we note that this algorithm could potentially offer a way to compute the scattering poles without relying on the physical properties of the scatterer, if it is possible to design an experiment that provides the measured interior scattering operator.

2 Scattering Poles for a Dirichlet Obstacle

Let D be a bounded simply connected region in $\mathbb{R}^m$ ($m = 2, 3$) with Lipschitz boundary ∂D. We denote by ν the outward unitary normal vector on ∂D. The scattering problem for a Dirichlet obstacle is formulated as: given an incident field v which is solution of the Helmholtz equation $\Delta v + k^2 v = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^m$ (except for possibly a subset of measure zero in the exterior of D), find the scattered field $u^s \in H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^m \setminus D)$ such that

$$\Delta u^s + k^2 u^s = 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{D}$$
$$u^s = -v \qquad \text{on } \partial D \tag{1}$$
$$\lim_{r \to \infty} r^{\frac{m-1}{2}} \left(\frac{\partial u^s}{\partial r} - i k u^s \right) = 0.$$

This problem is well-posed for $k \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\Im(k) \geq 0$. Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ be a bounded region such that $D \subset B$ with Lipschitz boundary ∂B, and consider incident waves $v := v_g$ which are superposition of point sources located at $y \in \partial B$ (otherwise refer to as surface potential) given by

$$v_g(x) = \int_{\partial B} g(y) \Phi_k(x, y) \, ds(y), \tag{2}$$

where $\Phi_k(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the fundamental solution of the Helmholtz equation defined by

$$\Phi_k(x, y) := \frac{i}{4} H_0^{(1)}(k|x - y|) \ \text{ for } m = 2 \text{ and } \Phi_k(x, y) = \frac{e^{ik|x-y|}}{4\pi|x - y|} \ \text{ for } m = 3.$$

By linearity of the direct scattering problem, the corresponding scattered field $u^s := u^s_g$ is given by

$$u^s_g(x) = \int_{\partial B} g(y) u^s(x, y) \, ds(y) \tag{3}$$

3

where $u^s(\cdot, y)$ is the scattered field due to a point source located at $y \in \partial B$, i.e. $u^s(\cdot, y)$ solves (1) with $v := \Phi(\cdot, y)$. In this framework, we define the relative scattering operator (aka near field operator) $\mathcal{S}_k : L^2(\partial B) \to L^2(\partial B)$ mapping

$$\mathcal{S}_k : g \mapsto u_g^s|_{\partial B}. \tag{4}$$

where u_g^s is given by (3). The interior eigenvalues arise from the study of the injectivity of the relative scattering operator $\mathcal{S}_k g = 0$, in other words looking for an incident field v_g that does not scatter by the Dirichlet obstacle D. One can easily check that $\mathcal{S}_k g = 0$ if k is a Dirichlet eigenvalue of the negative Laplacian in D and with corresponding eigenfunction of the form given by (2). We call such k non-scattering wave numbers. In general the Dirichlet eigenfunction is defined only in D, and may not even be extendable outside D as solution of the Helmholtz equation. Therefore not all Dirichlet eigenvalues are non-scattering wave number. In order to explore further this connection of Dirichlet eigenvalues with non-scattering wave numbers, we consider the forward problem with more general Dirichlet data, namely

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta w + k^2 w = 0 && \text{in } \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{D} \\
w = -v && \text{on } \partial D \\
\lim_{r \to \infty} r^{\frac{m-1}{2}} \left(\frac{\partial w}{\partial r} - ikw \right) = 0
\end{aligned}
\tag{5}
$$

where $v \in H_{inc}(D)$ defined by

$$H_{inc}(D) := \{ v \in H^1(D) : \quad \Delta v + k^2 v = 0 \} \quad \text{equipped with } H^1(D)\text{-norm.}$$

We obviously have

$$\mathcal{S}_k g = -\mathcal{W}_k \mathcal{H} g$$

where

$$\mathcal{W}_k : v \in H_{inc}(D) \mapsto w|_{\partial B} \in L^2(\partial B)$$

with w solving (5)

$$\text{and} \quad \mathcal{H} : g \mapsto v_g|_D, \quad L^2(\partial B) \to H^{inc}(D).$$

Hence $\mathcal{W}_k v = 0$ if and only if k is a Dirichlet eigenvalue with v the corresponding eigenfunctions. Since $\overline{\{ \mathcal{H}g, \ g \in L^2(\partial B) \}}^{H^1(D)} = H_{inc}(D)$ [4, Lemma 2.7], we can conclude that $k \in \mathbb{R}$ is a Dirichlet eigenvalue if and only if there exists a sequence of $g_j \in L^2(\partial B)$ such that the sequence $\mathcal{H}g_j$ converges to a nonzero $v \in \text{Kern } \mathcal{W}_k$ in $H^1(D)$-norm. The above characterization of Dirichlet eigenvalues is used to compute them merely from a knowledge of the relative scattering operator $\mathcal{S}_k$ using the linear sampling and generalized linear sampling methods [2], [3].

In [4, Section 2] a similar characterization of the scattering poles in terms of the kernel of a new scattering operator is introduced, which can be viewed as dual the the above characterization of the Dirichlet eigenvalues. Indeed, if we consider the scattering of $v = j_\ell(k|x|)Y_\ell(\hat{x})$ (which is a superposition of point sources located at infinity) by a Dirichlet ball of radius one in $\mathbb{R}^3$ we have that the Dirichlet eigenvalues are the zeros of $j_\ell(k) = 0$

(for such k, $j_\ell(k|x|)Y_\ell(\hat{x})$ is the corresponding eigenfunction), where the scattering poles are the zeros of $h_\ell^{(1)}(k) = 0$. We notice that $h_\ell^{(1)}(k|x|)Y_\ell(\hat{x})$ are superposition of point sources located at the origin [5]. This duality motivates the consideration of an appropriate interior scattering problem inside D which will be the basis of our characterization of scattering poles in the similar but dual to the Dirichlet eigenvalues stated above. For sake of readers convenience in the following we sketch this construction in [4, Section 2] and summarize the main theoretical results which will be the basis of our computational algorithm.

To this end, for a generic $m-1$ dimension closed Lipschitz manifold $\partial\mathcal{O}$ enclosing a bounded region $\mathcal{O}$, we recall the definition of the single layer potential $\mathrm{SL}_{\partial\mathcal{O}}^k : H^{s-1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O}) \to H_{loc}^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^m \setminus \partial\mathcal{O})$ (see e.g. [18] for the mapping properties)

$$\mathrm{SL}_{\partial\mathcal{O}}^k(\psi)(x) := \int_{\partial D} \psi(y)\Phi_k(x,y)\,ds_y, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \partial\mathcal{O}, \tag{6}$$

and double layer potential $\mathrm{DL}_{\partial\mathcal{O}}^k : H^{s+1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O}) \to H_{loc}^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^m \setminus \partial\mathcal{O})$

$$\mathrm{DL}_{\partial\mathcal{O}}^k(\psi)(x) := \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} \psi(y)\frac{\partial\Phi_k(x,y)}{\partial\nu_y}\,ds_y, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \partial\mathcal{O} \tag{7}$$

where $-1 \leq s \leq 1$ (this is the range for Lipschitz $\partial\mathcal{O}$, for smooth manifold the above mapping properties hold for larger $|s|$).

One then can prove that the scattering problem (5) is equivalent to seeking $w \in H_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^m \setminus D)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \Delta w + k^2 w = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{D} \\ w = f & \text{on } \partial D \\ w = \mathrm{SL}_{\partial D}^k(\partial w/\partial\nu) - \mathrm{DL}_{\partial D}^k(w) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{D} \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

which again has a unique solution for $k \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\Im(k) \geq 0$. This formulation allows us to define the scattering poles.

Definition 2.1. $k \in \mathbb{C}$ *is a scattering pole of the Dirichlet scattering problem for D if the homogeneous problem (8), i.e. with $f = 0$, has a non-trivial solution.*

This definition is equivalent to the one given in [25, Theorem 7.11]. It is well known that these scattering poles lie in the complex lower half plane $\mathbb{C}_- := \{z \in \mathbb{C}, \Im(z) < 0\}$ and form a discrete set without accumulation points. The dual notion mentioned above for the case of a ball motivated the introduction of the following interior scattering problem. Assume that $k > 0$ is not a Dirichlet eigenvalue (since we are interested in the scattering poles which are complex this assumption does not present any restrictions). Then for a point $z \in D$, let $u^s(\cdot, z) \in H^1(D)$ be the unique solution of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u^s(\cdot, z) + k^2 u^s(\cdot, z) = 0 & \text{in } D \\ u^s(\cdot, z) = -\Phi_k(\cdot, z) & \text{on } \partial D \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

Next consider a region $\mathcal{C} \subset D$ in $\mathbb{R}^m$ inside D with smooth Lipschitz boundary $\partial\mathcal{C}$ and define the interior scattering operator $\mathcal{N}_k : L^2(\partial\mathcal{C}) \to L^2(\partial\mathcal{C})$

$$\mathcal{N}_k\varphi(x) = \int_{\partial\mathcal{C}} \varphi(z)u^s(x,z)\,ds(z), \quad x \in \partial\mathcal{C} \tag{10}$$

5

The operator $\mathcal{N}_k$ is compact, symmetric (see [4, Lemma 2.5]) and maps

$$\mathcal{N}_k : \varphi \mapsto u^s_\varphi|_{\partial\mathcal{C}} \tag{11}$$

where $u^s_\varphi \in H^1(D)$ is the unique solution of

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta u^s_\varphi + k^2 u^s_\varphi = 0 &\qquad \text{in } D \\
u^s_\varphi = -\mathrm{SL}^k_{\partial\mathcal{C}}(\varphi) &\qquad \text{on } \partial D
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

with $\mathrm{SL}^k_{\partial\mathcal{C}}(\varphi)$ given by (6). The scattering poles are related to the injectivity of $\mathcal{N}_k$ which plays the same role that $\mathcal{S}_k$ plays with respect to the Dirichlet eigenvalues. More precisely, let us define the space of exterior incident fields

$$H^e_{\mathrm{inc}}(D) := \{w \in H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^m \setminus D), \ w \text{ satisfies } (14)\} \tag{13}$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\Delta w + k^2 w = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{D} \\
w = \mathrm{SL}^k_{\partial D}(\partial w/\partial\nu) - \mathrm{DL}^k_{\partial D}(w) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{D}.
\end{array} \right. \tag{14}$$

This space can be equipped with the norm

$$\|w\|_{H^e_{\mathrm{inc}}(D)} := \left(\|w\|^2_{H^{1/2}(\partial D)} + \|\partial w/\partial\nu\|^2_{H^{-1/2}(\partial D)} \right)^{1/2}.$$

We define the operator $\mathcal{G}_k : H^e_{\mathrm{inc}}(D) \to L^2(\partial\mathcal{C})$ as the mapping $w \mapsto u_w|_{\partial\mathcal{C}}$ with u_w the unique solution of

$$\Delta u_w + k^2 u_w = 0 \text{ in } D \qquad \text{and} \qquad u_w = -w \text{ on } \partial D. \tag{15}$$

Note that $H^e_{\mathrm{inc}}(D)$ and $\mathcal{G}_k$ with respect to the scattering poles play the same role that $H_{inc}(D)$ and $\mathcal{W}_k$ play with respect to the Dirichlet eigenvalues. Thus we have a new characterization of scattering poles for a Dirichlet obstacle in terms of the kernel of $\mathcal{G}_k$. To this end, let $\mathbb{C}_-$ denote the complex half place of complex numbers with negative imaginary parts. The following equivalence is proven in [4]

Definition 2.2. $k \in \mathbb{C}_-$ *is a scattering pole for a Dirichlet obstacle if and only if $\mathcal{G}_k$ is not injective.*

We remark that this definition uses the operator $\mathcal{G}_k$, hence it still involves the solution of the exterior scattering problem. Again in a similar fashion as for the Dirichlet eigenvalues, we want to use only the scattering operator $\mathcal{N}_k$ in the characterization and computation of the scattering poles. The following theorem states a collection of results proven in [4, Section 2]

Theorem 2.1. *Consider $k \in \mathbb{C}_-$. Then*

1. *The operator $\mathcal{N}_k\varphi = \mathcal{G}_k SL^k_{\partial\mathcal{C}}(\varphi)$ for all $\varphi \in L^2(\partial\mathcal{C})$.*

2. *The set $\{SL^k_{\partial\mathcal{C}}(\varphi); \ \varphi \in L^2(\partial\mathcal{C})\}$ is dense in $H^e_{\mathrm{inc}}(D)$.*

3. *The following holds:*

6

(i) *If k is not a scattering pole, then the operators $\mathcal{N}_k$ and $\mathcal{G}_k$ are injective. Further-more, $\Phi_k(\cdot, z)$ is in the range of $\mathcal{G}_k$ if and only if $z \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{D}$.*

(ii) *If k is a scattering pole, then $\Phi_k(\cdot, z)$ cannot be in the range of $\mathcal{G}_k$ for a dense set of points z in a ball $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{D}$.*

These results yield the following theorem that characterizes the scattering proles in terms of the range of the operator $\mathcal{N}_k$ which is the basis of our numerical algorithm for computing the scattering poles. For $\varphi \in L^2(\partial \mathcal{C})$ we set for short notation

$$P_k(\varphi) := \|\mathrm{SL}_{\partial \mathcal{C}}^k(\varphi)\|_{H_{\mathrm{inc}}^e(D)}^2.$$

We then define

$$J_\epsilon(\varphi, \psi) := \epsilon P_k(\varphi) + \|\mathcal{N}_k \varphi(\cdot, z) - \psi\|_{L^2(\partial \mathcal{C})}^2$$

and set

$$j_\epsilon^z := \inf_{\varphi \in L^2(\partial \mathcal{C})} J_\epsilon(\varphi, \Phi_k(\cdot, z)).$$

We then consider $\varphi_\epsilon^k(\cdot, z)$ to be the minimizing sequence satisfying

$$J_\epsilon(\varphi_\epsilon^k(\cdot, z), \Phi_k(\cdot, z)) \leq j_\epsilon^z + p(\epsilon)$$

where $p(\epsilon)/\epsilon \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. Then we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $k \in \mathbb{C}_-$. Then for any for any ball $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{D}$*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \|\mathcal{N}_k \varphi_\epsilon^k(\cdot, z) - \Phi_k(\cdot, z)\|_{L^2(\partial \mathcal{C})}^2 \to 0 \quad and \quad \limsup_{\epsilon \to 0} P_k(\varphi_\epsilon^k(\cdot, z)) < \infty, \quad (16)$$

for a dense set of points $z \in \Omega$ if and only if k is not a scattering pole.

If k is not a scattering pole then the proof of Theorem 2.2 follows from the Generalized Linear Sampling Method [3, Theorem 2.9] with $B = (\mathrm{SL}_{\partial \mathcal{C}}^k)^* \mathrm{SL}_{\partial \mathcal{C}}^k$, along with the injectivity and dense range of $\mathcal{N}_k$ and Theorem 2.1(i). In the case when k is a scattering pole, the proof of Theorem 2.2 follows the lines of [4, Theorem 2.12].

Theorem 2.2 provides the theoretical foundation of our algorithm for computing the scattering poles from a knowledge of the (computed or measured if possible) interior scattering operator $\mathcal{N}_k : L^2(\partial \mathcal{C}) \to L^2(\partial \mathcal{C})$. Next we explain the underlying ideas of the algorithm. To this end, let $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_k$ be an approximation of $\mathcal{N}_k$ that serves as a regularizer for $\mathcal{N}_k^{-1}$ (see the numerical section below for an example). Based on this theorem, if we set

$$\varphi^k(\cdot, z) := \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_k^{-1} \Phi_k(\cdot, z)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_k^{-1}$ is the pseudo-inverse of $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_k$, then one expects the quantity

$$\|\mathcal{N}_k \varphi^k(\cdot, z) - \Phi_k(\cdot, z)\|_{L^2(\partial \mathcal{C})}^2 + P_k(\varphi^k(\cdot, z))$$

to have large values at scattering poles for z in $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{D}$. The numerical evaluation of $P_k(\varphi^k(\cdot, z))$ may be time consuming and numerical experiments show that its behaviour with

respect to z is similar to the behaviour of the L^2-norm of the density $\varphi^k(\cdot, z)$. The misfit term $\|\mathcal{N}_k \varphi^k(\cdot, z) - \Phi_k(\cdot, z)\|^2_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{C})}$ is in the majority of the cases small and does not have significant contribution. Given these observations, we suggest to use the following numerical indicator function to identify the scattering poles:

$$I(k) := \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \|\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_k^{-1} \Phi_k(\cdot, z)\|^2_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{C})} \tag{17}$$

where $\mathcal{Z}$ is a set of points in $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{D}$. We expect this indicator function to have larger values at the location of scattering poles.

2.1 Numerical algorithm for two dimensional examples

We provide in this section a possible implementation of the method explained below for two dimensional problem ($m = 2$). The idea of this implementation is to take $\partial\mathcal{C}$ to be a circle of radius R_C and translate the coordinates system so that this circle is centered at the origin. In this case one can express equivalently the operator $\mathcal{N}_k$ using the Fourier transform with respect to the angular coordinate θ and construct a numerical rule to build a low rank $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_k$ that serves for evaluating (17).

A function $\varphi \in L^2(\partial\mathcal{C})$ can be decomposed in the Fourier domain as

$$\varphi(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{\varphi}_n e^{-in\theta(x)} \qquad \forall x \in \partial\mathcal{C}$$

and we set $\hat{\varphi} = (\hat{\varphi}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ which is an element of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ the set of square summable sequences. The image of φ by the operator $\mathcal{N}_k$ can written as

$$\mathcal{N}_k(\varphi)(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{\varphi}_n u_n^s(x); \quad x \in \partial\mathcal{C}$$

where we have set

$$u_n^s := \int_{\partial C} u^s(\cdot, y) e^{-in\theta(y)} ds(y).$$

The functions u_n^s can be computed directly by solving an interior problem. Indeed, thanks to the addition theorem

$$H_0^{(1)}(k|x - y|) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} H_n^{(1)}(k|x|) J_n(k|y|) e^{im(\theta(x) - \theta(y))}, \quad |x| > |y|. \tag{18}$$

Consequently, for $|y| = R_C$, $x \in \partial D$,

$$-\int_{\theta=0}^{2\pi} \frac{i}{4} H_0^{(1)}(k|x - y|) e^{in\theta(y)} d\theta = \frac{-i\pi}{2} H_n^{(1)}(k|x|) J_n(kR_C) e^{in\theta(x)}.$$

This implies that $u_n^s \in H^1(D)$ is the unique solution to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u_n^s + k^2 u_n^s = 0 & \text{in } D \\ u_n^s = -\frac{i\pi}{2} H_n^{(1)}(k|x|) J_n(kR_C) e^{in\theta(x)} & \text{on } \partial D. \end{cases} \tag{19}$$

Finally, by introducing the Fourier coefficients of the solution u_n^s

$$\hat{u}_{n,m}^s := \int_{\partial C} u_n^s(x) e^{-im\theta(x)} ds(x)$$

We observe that solving $\mathcal{N}_k \varphi = \psi$ is equivalent in the Fourier domain to solving $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_k \hat{\varphi} = \hat{\psi}$ where the operator $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_k : \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}) \to \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ is defined by

$$(\hat{\mathcal{N}}_k \hat{\varphi})_m := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{u}_{n,m}^s \hat{\varphi}_n.$$

As a numerical approximation of this operator we shall use the operator $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_k^N : \mathbb{C}^{2N+1} \to \mathbb{C}^{2N+1}$ defined by

$$(\hat{\mathcal{N}}_k^N \hat{\varphi})_m := \sum_{n=-N}^{n=N} \hat{u}_{n,m}^s \hat{\varphi}_n \quad , -N \le m \le N$$

where $N > 0$ is some truncation parameter that will be chosen later. Let us denote by $(\hat{\Phi}_k(z))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ the Fourier transform of $\Phi_k(\cdot, z)$. The addition formula shows that

$$(\hat{\Phi}_k(z))_n = \frac{i\pi}{2} H_n^{(1)}(k|z|) J_n(kR_C) e^{in\theta(z)}.$$

Let $\hat{\Phi}_k^N(z) \in \mathbb{C}^{2N+1}$ be the vector formed by $(\hat{\Phi}_k(z))_n$ with $n = -N, \dots N$. Equivalently to (17), we shall use as indicator function for scattering poles, the function

$$\hat{I}(k) := \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \|(\hat{\mathcal{N}}_k^N)^{-1} \hat{\Phi}_k^N(z)\|_{\mathbb{C}^{2N+1}}^2 \tag{20}$$

Notice that in practice the truncation parameter N would depend on R_C and k. It has to be chosen so that the condition number of the matrix $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_k^N$ is compatible with the available machine precision.

2.1.1 Analytic expression in the case of circular domain

In the case of a circular domain, it is possible to have an analytic expression of the operator $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_k$ and therefore an analytic expression of $\hat{I}(k)$. Assume that the domain D is the disk of radius R_D. In this case, the scattering poles are formed by the zeros of $k \mapsto H_n^{(1)}(kR_D)$. For $k \in \mathbb{C}_-$, the scattered field u_n^s solution of (19) is then given by

$$u_n^s(x) = \frac{-i\pi}{2} \frac{H_n^{(1)}(kR_D) J_n(kR_C)}{J_n(kR_D)} J_n(k|x|) e^{in\theta(x)}.$$

This leads to

$$\hat{u}_{n,n}^s = -i\pi^2 R_C \frac{H_n^{(1)}(kR_D) J_n(kR_C)^2}{J_n(kR_D)} \quad \text{and } \hat{u}_{n,m}^s = 0 \text{ if } n \ne m$$

9

which indicates that the operator $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_k^N$ is diagonal and invertible for all $k \in \mathbb{C}_-$ outside the scattering poles. One then obtains

$$\hat{I}(k) := \frac{1}{2\pi R_C} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{n=-N}^{n=N} \left| \frac{J_n(kR_D)H_n^{(1)}(k|z|)}{H_n^{(1)}(kR_D)J_n(kR_C)} \right|^2$$

This expression clearly shows that if we choose $|z| > R_D$ to form a dense set in an interval, $\hat{I}(k) \to \infty$ as k approaches any scattering poles that are zeros of $H_n^{(1)}(kR_D)$ for $-N \le n \le N$.

3 Extension to the Scattering Problem for an Impedance Obstacle

The algorithm described above and the related theory can be naturally extended to other boundary conditions. The advantage of our computational method for the scattering poles is that once the interior scattering operator $\mathcal{N}_k : L^2(\partial \mathcal{C}) \to L^2(\partial \mathcal{C})$ corresponding to that scattering problem is available then in principle the algorithm is implemented in the same way without making use of the physical properties of the scatterer. We describe this extension in the case of the scattering problem for an obstacle with impedance boundary conditions. Under the same assumption for D the scattering problem now reads

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta u^s + k^2 u^s = 0 \qquad & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{D} \\
\frac{\partial u^s}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta u^s = -\left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta v \right) \qquad & \text{on } \partial D \\
\lim_{r \to \infty} r^{\frac{m-1}{2}} \left(\frac{\partial u^s}{\partial r} - iku^s \right) = 0,
\end{aligned}
\tag{21}
$$

where $\eta \in L^\infty(\partial D)$ such that $\Re(\eta)(x) \ge 0$ for almost all $x \in \partial D$. This problem is well-posed for $k \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\Im(k) \ge 0$. Note that our approach can be generalized verbatim to k dependent η which model dispersive thin layer coating D. More specifically in this case one assumes that $\eta = \eta(k)$ depends analytically on k and is such that $\Im(\eta(k)) < 0$ if $k \in \mathbb{C}_-$. However for purpose of presentation here we assume that η is independent of k. Under these assumption we can define the scattering poles for impedance obstacle. The above scattering problem can be equivalently written as given $f \in H^{-1/2}(\partial D)$ find $w \in H^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^m \setminus D)$ such that

$$
\begin{cases}
\Delta w + k^2 w = 0 \qquad & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{D} \\
\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta w = f \qquad & \text{on } \partial D \\
w = \text{SL}_{\partial D}^k(\partial w / \partial \nu) - \text{DL}_{\partial D}^k(w) \qquad & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{D}
\end{cases}
\tag{22}
$$

Definition 3.1. $k \in \mathbb{C}$ *is a scattering pole of the scattering problem for D with impedance boundary conditions if the homogeneous problem (22), i.e. with $f = 0$, has a non-trivial solution.*

Under the above assumptions on η, it is known that these scattering poles lie in the complex lower half plane $\mathbb{C}_- := \{z \in \mathbb{C}, \ \Im(z) < 0\}$ and form a discrete set without accumulation points [25]. The corresponding interior scattering problem is now formulated as: For a point $z \in D$, $u^s(\cdot, z) \in H^1(D)$ is the unique solution of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u^s(\cdot, z) + k^2 u^s(\cdot, z) = 0 & \text{in } D \\ \dfrac{\partial u^s(\cdot, z)}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta u^s(\cdot, z) = -\left(\dfrac{\partial \Phi_k(\cdot, z)}{\partial \nu} + i\eta \Phi_k(\cdot, z) \right) & \text{on } \partial D \end{cases} \tag{23}$$

Since we are interested in the scattering poles, we restrict $k \in \mathbb{C}_-$, and this problem has a unique solutions since the impedance eigenvalues have positive imaginary part. One then defines the operator $\mathcal{N}_k$ the same way as (10) where now $u^s(x, z)$ is given by (23).

Theorem 3.1. *Assume $k \in \mathbb{C}_-$ is not a scattering pole. Then the operator $\mathcal{N}_k : L^2(\partial \mathcal{C}) \longrightarrow L^2(\partial \mathcal{C})$ is injective.*

Proof. Let $g \in L^2(\partial \mathcal{C})$ be such that $\mathcal{N}_k(g) = 0$ on $\partial \mathcal{C}$. u_g^s solves the Helmholtz equation in $D \supset \mathcal{C}$ and $u_g^s|_{\partial \mathcal{C}} = 0$, and since k^2 is not a Dirichlet eigenvalue in $\mathcal{C}$, $u_g^s = 0$ in $\mathcal{C}$. By a unique continuation $u_g^s = 0$ in D and hence $\dfrac{\partial u_g^s}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta u_g^s = 0$ on ∂D. By linearity and superposition $-\left(\dfrac{\partial u_g^s}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta u_g^s \right) = \dfrac{\partial \mathrm{SL}_{\partial \mathcal{C}}(g)}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta \mathrm{SL}_{\partial \mathcal{C}}(g) = 0$ on ∂D. Since $\mathrm{SL}_{\partial \mathcal{C}}(g)$ solves (22) with $f = 0$ and since k is not a scattering pole of the impedance problem, $\mathrm{SL}_{\partial \mathcal{C}}(g) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^m \backslash \overline{D}$, and by unique continuation, in $\mathbb{R}^3 \backslash C$. In addition we also have $\mathrm{SL}_{\partial \mathcal{C}}(g) = 0$ in $\mathcal{C}$. Finally, using the jump relation on $\partial \mathcal{C}$ for the normal derivative of the single layer potential [18], we obtain $g = 0$. $\square$

By obvious modifications of the proof of [4, Lemma 2.5] we can prove the following lemma

Lemma 3.1. *The operator $\mathcal{N}_k$ is symmetric, that is its transpose operator $\mathcal{N}_k^T : L^2(\partial \mathcal{C}) \longrightarrow L^2(\partial \mathcal{C})$ verifies $\mathcal{N}_k^T(g) = \mathcal{N}_k(g)$, where $\mathcal{N}_k^T$ is defined by*

$$\int_{\partial \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{N}_k(g)(x) f(x) ds(x) = \int_{\partial \mathcal{C}} g(x) \mathcal{N}_k^T(f)(x) ds(x), \qquad \forall f, g \in L^2(\partial \mathcal{C})$$

Combining Theorem 3.2 and Lemma 3.1 we conclude that

Theorem 3.2. *Assume $k \in \mathbb{C}_-$ is not a scattering pole. Then the operator $\mathcal{N}_k : L^2(\partial \mathcal{C}) \longrightarrow L^2(\partial \mathcal{C})$ has dense range.*

In the impedance case the operator $\mathcal{G}_k : H^e_{\mathrm{inc}}(D) \to L^2(\partial \mathcal{C})$ maps $w \mapsto u_w|_{\partial \mathcal{C}}$ with u_w the unique solution of

$$\Delta u_w + k^2 u_w = 0 \text{ in } D \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{\partial u_w}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta u_w = -\left(\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta w \right) \text{ on } \partial D. \tag{24}$$

We next prove an equivalent definition of the scattering poles with Definition 3.1.

Definition 3.2. *$k \in \mathbb{C}_-$ is a scattering pole for an impedance obstacle if and only if $\mathcal{G}_k$ is not injective.*

11

Proof of the equivalence of Definitions 3.1 and 3.2. (i) Let us suppose k is a scattering pole for the impedance problem in D and write $w_0 \in H_{\text{inc}}^e(D)$ its associated eigenfunction, where $H_{\text{inc}}^e(D)$ given by (13). Then $\dfrac{\partial w_0}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta w_0 = 0$ on ∂D, therefore as k is not an eigenvalue of the impedance problem in D, $u_{w_0} = 0$ in D and therefore $\mathcal{G}_k(w_0) = 0$.

(ii) Conversely, let us suppose there exists a non trivial $w_0 \in H_{\text{inc}}^e(D)$ such that $\mathcal{G}_k(w_0) = 0$. Then $u_{w_0} = 0$ on ∂C and as k is not a Dirichlet eigenvalue in C, $u_{w_0} = 0$ in C and by unique continuation, in D. By uniqueness of the impedance problem in D, $\dfrac{\partial u_{w_0}}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta u_{w_0} = 0$ on ∂D, and therefore $\dfrac{\partial w_0}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta w_0 = 0$ on ∂D. That is w_0 is an eigenfunction of the impedance boundary problem, ie k is a scattering pole of the impedance problem.

$\square$

Lemma 3.2. *Assume $k \in \mathbb{C}_-$ is not a scattering pole of the impedance problem in D, and let $z \in \mathbb{R}^m \backslash \overline{C}$. Then $\Phi_k(\cdot, z)$ is in the range of $\mathcal{G}_k$ if and only if $z \in \mathbb{R}^m \backslash \overline{D}$.*

Proof. (i) If $z \in \mathbb{R}^m \backslash \overline{D}$, then we find $w \in H_{\text{inc}}^e(D)$ to be the unique solution of the exterior impedance problem (22) with the right hand side $f = \dfrac{\partial \Phi_k(\cdot, z)}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta \Phi_k(\cdot, z)$ on ∂D. By uniqueness of the impedance problem in D, we immediately have $\mathcal{G}_k(w) = \Phi_k(\cdot, z)|_C$.

(ii) Conversely, assume to the contrary that for $z \in D \backslash \overline{C}$, there exists $w \in H_{\text{inc}}^e(D)$ such that $\mathcal{G}_k(w) = \Phi(\cdot, z)$. This means that there exists u_w satisfying (24) with $u_w = \Phi_k(\cdot, z)$ on ∂C. Since both u_w and $\Phi(\cdot, z)$ satisfy the Helmholtz equation in C then by uniqueness of the Dirichlet problem $u_w = \Phi_k(\cdot, z)$ in C and hence in D by unique continuation. This is a contradiction since $u_w \in H^1(D \backslash \overline{C})$ and $\Phi_k(\cdot, z) \notin H^1(D \backslash \overline{C})$.

$\square$

Lemma 3.3. *Assume $k \in \mathbb{C}_-$ is a scattering pole of the impedance problem in D. Then $\Phi_k(\cdot, z)$ cannot be in the range of $\mathcal{G}_k$ for a dense set of points z in a ball $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{D}$.*

Proof. Assume that $k \in \mathbb{C}_-$ is a scattering pole and let w_0 be the solution of (22) with $f = 0$. Assume to the contrary that for a dense set of points $z \in \Omega$ we have that $\mathcal{G}_k(w_z) = \Phi(\cdot, z)$ with $w_z \in H_{\text{inc}}^e(D)$. Thus we have that there exists the corresponding $u_z \in H^1(D)$ satisfying (24) and $u_z|_{\partial C} = \Phi_z(\cdot, z)$. We deduce by uniqueness of the Dirichlet problem inside C that $u_z = \Phi_k(\cdot, z)$ in C and by unique continuation in D. By uniqueness of the impedance boundary problem in D, we have $\frac{\partial u_z}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta u_z = \frac{\partial \Phi_k(\cdot, z)}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta \Phi_k(\cdot, z)$ on ∂D, that is $\frac{\partial w_z}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta w_z = \frac{\partial \Phi_k(\cdot, z)}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta \Phi_k(\cdot, z)$ on ∂D.
For a generic $m-1$-dimension closed Lipschitz manifold without boundary $\partial \mathcal{O}$ introduce the boundary integral operators obtained from (6) and (7) and their derivative by aproaching the boundary $\partial \mathcal{O}$

$$\mathcal{S}_{\partial\mathcal{O}}^k : H^{-1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O}) \to H^{1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O}) \qquad \psi \mapsto \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} \psi(y)\Phi_k(\cdot,y)ds(y)$$

$$\mathcal{K}_{\partial\mathcal{O}}^k : H^{1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O}) \to H^{1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O}) \qquad \psi \mapsto \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} \psi(y)\frac{\partial\Phi_k(\cdot,y)}{\partial\nu_y}ds(y)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\partial\mathcal{O}}^k : H^{-1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O}) \to H^{-1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O}) \qquad \psi \mapsto \int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} \psi(y)\frac{\partial\Phi_k(\cdot,y)}{\partial\nu_.}ds(y)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\partial\mathcal{O}}^k : H^{1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O}) \to H^{-1/2}(\partial\mathcal{O}) \qquad \psi \mapsto \frac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\int_{\partial\mathcal{O}} \psi(y)\frac{\partial\Phi_k(\cdot,y)}{\partial\nu_y}ds(y)$$

Applying the impedance boundary condition on the Green's representation formula for w_0 approaching ∂D from the outside we have

$$\left(\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\partial D}^k - \frac{1}{2} + ik\eta\mathcal{S}_{\partial D}^k\right)\frac{\partial w_0}{\partial\nu} - \left(\mathcal{L}_{\partial D}^k + ik\eta\mathcal{K}_{\partial D}^k + \frac{ik\eta}{2}\right)w_0 = 0$$

and using $\frac{\partial w_0}{\partial\nu} = -ik\eta w_0$ yields

$$\left(ik\eta\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\partial D}^k + (ik\eta)^2\mathcal{S}_{\partial D}^k + \mathcal{L}_{\partial D}^k + ik\eta\mathcal{K}_{\partial D}^k\right)w_0 = 0 \tag{25}$$

In a similar way, we have the impedance boundary condition of w_z by approaching ∂D from outside in the Green's representation formula

$$\frac{\partial w_z}{\partial\nu} + ik\eta w_z = -\left(\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\partial D}^k - \frac{1}{2} + ik\eta\mathcal{S}_{\partial D}^k\right)\frac{\partial w_z}{\partial\nu} + \left(\mathcal{L}_{\partial D}^k + i\eta k\mathcal{K}_{\partial D}^k + \frac{ik\eta}{2}\right)w_z$$

which we can write as

$$\frac{\partial w_z}{\partial\nu} + ik\eta w_z = -2\left(\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\partial D}^k + ik\eta\mathcal{S}_{\partial D}^k\right)\frac{\partial w_z}{\partial\nu} + 2\left(\mathcal{L}_{\partial D}^k + ik\eta\mathcal{K}_{\partial D}^k\right)w_z \tag{26}$$

Taking now the trace of the representation formula u_z and its normal derivative on ∂D from inside yields

$$\frac{\partial u_z}{\partial\nu} + ik\eta u_z = \left(\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\partial D}^k + \frac{1}{2} + ik\eta\mathcal{S}_{\partial D}^k\right)\frac{\partial u_z}{\partial\nu} - \left(\mathcal{L}_{\partial D}^k + ik\eta\mathcal{K}_{\partial D}^k - \frac{ik\eta}{2}\right)$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{\partial u_z}{\partial\nu} + ik\eta u_z = 2\left(\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\partial D}^k + ik\eta\mathcal{S}_{\partial D}^k\right)\frac{\partial u_z}{\partial\nu} - 2\left(\mathcal{L}_{\partial D}^k + ik\eta\mathcal{K}_{\partial D}^k\right)u_z. \tag{27}$$

Next we multiply (27) by w_0 and integrate over ∂D. Using $\frac{\partial u_z}{\partial\nu} = -ik\eta u_z + \frac{\partial w_z}{\partial\nu} + ik\eta w_z$ we obtain that

$$\int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial\Phi_k(\cdot,z)}{\partial\nu}w_0 + ik\eta\Phi_k(\cdot,z)w_0\, ds = \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial\nu} + ik\eta u_z w_0\, ds$$

$$= \int_{\partial D} 2\left(\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\partial D}^k + ik\eta\mathcal{S}_{\partial D}^k\right)\frac{\partial u_z}{\partial\nu}w_0 - 2\left(\mathcal{L}_{\partial D}^k + i\eta k\mathcal{K}_{\partial D}^k\right)u_z w_0\, ds$$

$$= \int_{\partial D} 2\left(\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\partial D}^k + ik\eta\mathcal{S}_{\partial D}^k\right)\left(\frac{\partial w_z}{\partial\nu} + ik\eta w_z\right)w_0\, ds$$

$$- \int_{\partial D} 2\left(ik\eta\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\partial D}^k + (ik\eta)^2\mathcal{S}_{\partial D}^k + \mathcal{L}_{\partial D}^k + ik\eta\mathcal{K}_{\partial D}^k\right)u_z w_0\, ds.$$

13

Thanks to the identities $\mathcal{K}_{\partial D}^{k}{}^{\top} = \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\partial D}^{k}$, $\mathcal{L}_{\partial D}^{k}{}^{\top} = \mathcal{L}_{\partial D}^{k}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\partial D}^{k}{}^{\top} = \mathcal{S}_{\partial D}^{k}$ [18] and the relation (25), the second integral is zero. We now use the identity (26) to replace $2\left(\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\partial D}^{k} + ik\eta \mathcal{S}_{\partial D}^{k}\right) \frac{\partial w_z}{\partial \nu}$ in the first integral, which gives

$$\int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial \Phi_k(\cdot, z)}{\partial \nu} w_0 + ik\eta \Phi_k(\cdot, z) w_0 \, ds = -\int_{\partial D} \left(\frac{\partial w_z}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta w_z\right) w_0 \, ds$$

$$+ 2\int_{\partial D} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\partial D}^{k} + ik\eta \mathcal{K}_{\partial D}^{k} + ik\eta \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{\partial D}^{k} + (ik\eta)^2 \mathcal{S}_{\partial D}^{k}\right) w_z w_0 \, ds.$$

Knowing $\dfrac{\partial w_z}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta w_z = \dfrac{\partial \Phi_k(\cdot, z)}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta \Phi_k(\cdot, z)$ and using again (25), we can conclude that

$$u(z) := \int_{\partial D} \frac{\partial \Phi_k(\cdot, z)}{\partial \nu} w_0 + ik\eta \Phi_k(\cdot, z) w_0 \, ds = \mathrm{DL}_{\partial D}^{k}(w_0)(z) - \mathrm{SL}_{\partial D}^{k}\left(\frac{\partial w_0}{\partial \nu}\right)(z) = 0$$

for a dense set of points z in Ω, where we use that $ik\eta w_0 = -\frac{\partial w_0}{\partial \nu}$. Since $u(z)$ is a solution to the Helmholtz equation in $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{D}$ hence analytic, we conclude that $u(z) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{D}$ On the other hand $u(z)$ as a solution of Helmholtz equation inside D. Letting z approach the boundary from both sides, using the jump relations of single and double potentials, and knowing that $u^+|_{\partial D} = \frac{\partial u^+}{\partial \nu}|_{\partial D} = 0$ (traces from outside D) give

$$\frac{\partial u^-}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta u^- = \frac{\partial w_0}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta w_0 = 0. \tag{28}$$

Therefore by uniqueness of the impedance problem inside D we conclude $u = 0$ in D. Using the jump relation of u over ∂D, we have $w_0|_{\partial D} = \dfrac{\partial w_0}{\partial \nu}|_{\partial D} = 0$. By Holmgren's theorem $w_0 = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{D}$, which is a contradiction. This proves the lemma. $\square$

Obviously we have that $\mathcal{N}_k \varphi = \mathcal{G}_k \mathrm{SL}_{\partial \mathcal{C}}^{k}(\varphi)$ for all $\varphi \in L^2(\partial \mathcal{C})$ and that $\{\mathrm{SL}_{\partial \mathcal{C}}^{k}(\varphi); \ \varphi \in L^2(\partial \mathcal{C})\}$ is dense in $H_{\mathrm{inc}}^{e}(D)$. Thus the above discussion provides all the ingredients to prove Theorem 2.2 which is the theoretical basis of our computational algorithm.

In a similar way as for the Dirichlet problem in Section 2.1, for the numerical implementation of the algorithm in the 2D case we can obtain an explicit expression of the operator $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_k$ in the Fourier domain. For the impedance problem the functions u_n^s are now defined as the unique solution in $H^1(D)$ of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u_n^s + k^2 u_n^s = 0 & \text{in } D \\ \frac{\partial u_n^s}{\partial \nu} + i\eta u = f_n & \text{on } \partial D \end{cases}$$

where

$$f_n(x) := \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} + ik\eta\right)\left(\frac{-i\pi}{2} H_n^{(1)}(k|x|) J_n(kR_C) e^{in\theta(x)}\right) \quad x \in \partial D.$$

Using the formula for Bessel and Hankel functions

$$\mathcal{X}_n'(x) = -\mathcal{X}_{n+1}(x) + \frac{n}{x}\mathcal{X}_n(x) \tag{29}$$

14

for $\mathcal{X}_n = H_n^{(1)}$ or J_n we end up with

$$f_n(x) = \frac{i\pi}{2} J_n(kR_C) e^{in\theta(x)} \left[\left(-kH_{n+1}^{(1)}(k|x|) + \frac{n}{|x|} H_n^{(1)}(k|x|) \right) \frac{x \cdot \nu}{|x|} + i\eta(k) H_n^{(1)}(k|x|) \right].$$

The rest of the implementation works in the same way as in Section 2.1.

3.0.1 Analytic expression in the case of a circular domain

Assume that the domain D is the disk of radius R_D centered at the origin and $\eta := \eta(k)$ does not depend of the angular variable. Then the scattering poles are the zeros of the functions

$$f_n(k) := -kH_{n+1}^{(1)}(kR_D) + \left(\frac{n}{R_D} + i\eta(k) \right) H_n^{(1)}(kR_D). \tag{30}$$

One can solves explicitly for u_n^s and get

$$u_n^s(x) = \frac{-i\pi}{2} J_n(kR_C) \frac{\left[-kH_{n+1}^{(1)}(kR_D) + \left(\frac{n}{R_D} + i\eta(k) \right) H_n^{(1)}(kR_D) \right]}{\left[-kJ_{n+1}(kR_D) + \left(\frac{n}{R_D} + i\eta(k) \right) J_n(kR_D) \right]} J_n(k|x|) e^{in\theta(x)}.$$

This again leads to a diagonal operator $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_k$ with diagonal terms given by

$$\hat{u}_{n,n}^s = -i\pi^2 R_C J_n(kR_C)^2 \frac{\left[-kH_{n+1}^{(1)}(kR_D) + \left(\frac{n}{R_D} + i\eta(k) \right) H_n^{(1)}(kR) \right]}{\left[-kJ_{n+1}(kR_D) + \left(\frac{n}{R_D} + i\eta(k) \right) J_n(kR_D) \right]}.$$

Consequently, the truncated indicator function takes the expression

$$\hat{I}(k) = \frac{1}{2\pi R_C} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{n=-N}^{n=N} \left| \frac{H_n^{(1)}(k|z|)}{J_n(kR_C)} \frac{\left[-kJ_{n+1}(kR) + \left(\frac{n}{R} + i\eta(k) \right) J_n(kR) \right]}{\left[-kH_{n+1}^{(1)}(kR) + \left(\frac{n}{R} + i\eta(k) \right) H_n^{(1)}(kR) \right]} \right|^2$$

We again observe that this indicator function goes to ∞ as k approaches a scattering poles if the points z are chosen such that they are not zeros of $H_n^{(1)}(k|z|)$.

4 Numerical validation

To build the matrix $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_k$, we use Gypsilab [9], an open Matlab toolbox, which enables us to solve our boundary value problems for u_n^s using variational techniques.

A key parameter in our method is the choice of N, the number of Fourier parameter used in truncating the operator $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_k$. As we indicated earlier, this number should be tuned in order to control the conditioning of the matrix operator $\hat{N}_k^N$. Indeed, in the case of a circle, one can see from the analytical expressions derived above that the conditioning grows exponentially with respect to N. On the other hand, a number of Fourier coefficients that is too small will lower the precision as it would not allow to reach scattering poles that are the zeros of Hankel functions with order greater than N. This is specific to the circles. For general domains,

we may rephrase this requirement as a precision constraint, meaning that $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_k^N$ should be a sufficiently accurate approximation of $\mathcal{N}_k$. It is also related to the fact that the incident field $\Phi(\cdot, z)$ for $z \in \mathcal{C}$ should be accurately approximated on ∂D by its truncated Fourier series. Consider the case where D is the unit disk and ∂C be the circle of radius $1/2$. We plot in Figure 1 for different values of $k = Re(k) - 0.5i$, $Re(k) \in [0; 20]$, the maximal number of Fourier coefficients N such that the conditioning of stays bellow 10^2, and the minimal number N to reach 95% of the norm of the incident field.

Figure 1: Choice of a the cutoff value for Fourier coefficients

As a rule of thumb, choosing $N \sim |k|R_C + 4$, seems to provide a good balance. This has been confirmed by many other experiments not reported here. This choice is the one adopted in the following experiments.

Validation in the case of a disc

It is possible to numerically determine the scattering poles as the zeros of the functions f_n given by (30). We exploit the Cauchy integral to compute these zeros, using the identity

$$\frac{1}{2i\pi} \int_\gamma k^\ell \frac{f_n'(k)}{f_n(k)} dk = \sum_{i=1}^{M} m_i k_i^\ell$$

where k_i, $i = 1, \ldots M$, are the zeros inside the direct contour γ and m_i are their order. Using $\ell = 1$, this allows an accurate evaluation of scattering poles that have simple multiplicities by choosing the contour γ to be sufficiently small so that it contains only one pole. The number of poles lying inside γ can be determined using $\ell = 0$. For f_n given by (30), the derivative is given by

$$\frac{df}{dk} = kRH_{n+2}(kR) - (2(n+1) - Ri\eta(k))H_{n+1}(kR) + (i\eta'(k) + \frac{n}{k}i\eta + \frac{n^2}{kR})H_n(kR)$$

We take a circle of radius $R = 1.3$ and an impedance function $\eta(k) = \frac{k}{10}$. Thanks to the Cauchy integral we find the poles of f :

$$\begin{cases} k_1 = 0.3593 - 0.4712i & \text{for } n = 1 \\ k_2 = 1.0490 - 0.6304 & \text{for } n = 2 \\ k_3 = 1.7514 - 0.7435 & \text{for } n = 3 \\ k_4 = 2.4627 - 0.8346 & \text{for } n = 4 \end{cases}$$

Searching in the area $[0; 3] \times [-1; 0]$, we compute $\hat{I}(k)$ for values of k in a uniform grid with a step size 210^{-2}. Figure 2 displays the obtained indicator function where we clearly see the peaks at the location of the scattering poles. The coordinates of the peaks (with the used mesh step) give the following approximations for these scattering poles

$$\begin{cases} k_1^{res} = 0.3503 - 0.4704i \\ k_2^{res} = 1.0554 - 0.6336i \\ k_3^{res} = 1.7606 - 0.7356i \\ k_4^{res} = 2.4657 - 0.8376i \end{cases}$$

Figure 2: The indicator function $\hat{I}(k)$ for a circle of radius 1.3 and an impedance $\eta(k) = k/10$.

The case of a kite

We consider a different shape, a kite which is a deformation of a circle that has the geometry described in the Figure 3. The equation of the kite is given by:

$$\mathcal{K}(\theta) = (\cos(\theta) + 0.65\cos(2\theta) - 0.65, 1.5\sin(\theta)), \qquad \theta \in [0; 2\pi]$$

17

Figure 3: Geometry of a kite compared to the circle of radius 1.3

Searching in the same area as in the previous example, we get 4 peaks corresponding to 4 scattering poles (see Figure 4) :

$$\begin{cases} k_1^{res} = 0.3707 - 0.4908i \\ k_2^{res} = 1.1798 - 0.6336i \\ k_3^{res} = 2.0464 - 0.8176i \\ k_4^{res} = 2.9292 - 0.9000i \end{cases}$$


Figure 4: The indicator function $\hat{I}(k)$ for the Kite depicted in Figure 3 and an impedance $\eta(k) = k/10$.

Seeing the kite as a deformation of the circle we can compare the values of their poles. They count the same number of poles, so we can pair them. The greater the distance to the origin, the less similar the poles seems to be (see 5).

Figure 5: Poles of the Impedance Boundary Problem for a kite and a circle

The influence of the impedance parameter

We can see that for $\eta = 0$, the problem corresponds to the Neumann boundary value problem, and for $\eta \longrightarrow \infty$ it becomes the Dirichlet boundary value problem. The values of the poles are continuous with respect to η, as the shape of the curve indicate when the parameter η is varied 0 to ∞ (see Figure)


Figure 6: Tracing the change of a scattering pole in terms of η as it changes from zero (Dirichlet) to ∞ (Neuman)

The influence of continues perturbation of the kite

We modify the equation of the kite as follow

$$\mathcal{K}(\theta) = (\cos(\theta) + a \cdot \cos(2\theta) - a, 1.5\sin(\theta)), \qquad \theta \in [0; 2\pi]$$

where a becomes a parameter of the shape. We numerically compute the surface of the kite and notice the area is invariant with a. We try to vary this parameter, and observe the shift of the pole. The result is shown in Figure 7.

Figure 7: Tracing the change of a scattering pole with respect to smooth surface preserving perturbation of the kite region with impedance boundary condition

Of course these numerical examples are preliminary and are meant as proof of concept. Nevertheless they show the viability of our numerical method. They also show that the scattering poles carry geometric and physical information about the scattering object.

Acknowledgments

References

[1] L. Audibert and H. Haddar, A generalized formulation of the linear sampling method with exact characterization of targets in terms of farfield measurements, *Inverse Problems* **30** no. 3, 035011(2014).

[2] F. Cakoni, D. Colton, and H. Haddar, On the determination of Dirichlet and transmission eigenvalues from far field data, *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. 1* **348** 379-383 (2010).

[3] F. Cakoni, D. Colton and H. Haddar, *Inverse Scattering Theory and Transmission Eigenvalues*, 2nd Edition, CBMS Series, SIAM Publications, **98** 2023.

[4] F. Cakoni, D. Colton and H. Haddar, A duality between scattering poles and transmission eigenvalues in scattering theory, *Proc. A.* **476** no. 2244, 20200612, 19 pp, (2020).

[5] D. Colton and R. Kress. *Inverse Acoustic and Electromagnetic Scattering Theory*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, **93** Springer, New York, 4nd Edition, 2019.

[6] K. Datchev, D Kang, and A. Kessler, Non-trapping surfaces of revolution with long-living resonances, *Math. Res. Lett.* **22** (2015)

[7] S. Dyatlov and M. Zworski, *Mathematical Theory of Scattering Resonances*, AMS Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 200, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2019.

[8] J. Gopalakrishnan, S. Moskow and F. Santosa, Asymptotic and numerical techniques for resonances of thin photonic structures, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **69** no. 1, 37-63 (2008).

[9] Gypsilab, *open Matlab toolbox* https://github.com/matthieuaussal/gypsilab.

[10] A. Kirsch and A. Lechleiter, The inside-outside duality for scattering problems by inhomogeneous media, *Inverse Problems* **29** paper 104011 (2013).

[11] R. Kohn, J. Lu, B. Schweizer, and M. Weinstein, A variational perspective on cloaking by anomalous localized resonance, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **328** no. 1, 1-27 (2014).

[12] P. D. Lax and R. S. Phillips, *Scattering Theory* 2nd Edition, Pure and Applied Mathematics, 26. Academic Press, Inc., Boston, MA, 1989.

[13] C. Labreuche, Problèmes inversés en diffraction d'ondes basses sur la notion de résonance, *Diss. Paris 9*, 1997.

[14] C. Labreuche, Generalization of the Schwarz reflection principle in scattering theory for dissipative systems: Application to purely imaginary resonant frequencies, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **30**, no 4, 848-878 (1999).

[15] C. Labreuche, Uniqueness and stability of the recovery of a sound soft obstacle from a knowledge of its scattering resonances, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **23** no. 9-10, 1719-1748 (1998).

[16] C. Labreuche, Purely imaginary resonant frequencies for a lossy inhomogeneous medium, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **59** no. 2, 725-742 (1998).

[17] C. Labreuche, Inverse obstacle scattering problem based on resonant frequencies, *Lecture Notes in Phys.* **486** 169-185 (1997).

[18] W. McLean, *Strongly elliptic systems and boundary integral equations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.

[19] R.B. Melrose, *Geometric Scattering Theory.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[20] T. Meklachi, S. Moskow and J. Schotland, Asymptotic analysis of resonances of small volume high contrast linear and nonlinear scatterers, *J. Math. Phys.* **59** no. 8, 083502, 20 pp (2018).

[21] B. Osting and M. Weinstein, Long-lived scattering resonances and Bragg structures, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **73** no. 2, 827-852 (2013).

[22] J. Ralston, Variation of the transmission coefficient and comparison theorems for the purely imaginary poles of the scattering matrix, *Comm. Pure Applied Math* **25**, 45-61, (1972).

[23] P. Stefanov, Sharp upper bounds on the number of the scattering poles, *J. Funct. Anal.* **231** no. 1, 111-142 (2006).

[24] P. Stefanov, Quasimodes and resonances: sharp lower bounds, *Duke Math. J.* **99** no. 1, 75-92 (1999).

[25] M. Taylor, *Partial differential equations. II. Qualitative studies of linear equations* Applied Mathematical Sciences, **116** Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.

[26] Y. Ma and J. Sun, Computation of scattering poles using boundary integrals, *Appl. Math. Lett.* **146** Paper No. 108792, 7 pp (2023).

[27] M. Zworski, Dimension of the limit set and the density of resonances for convex co-compact hyperbolic surfaces, *Invent. Math.* **136** 353-409 (1999).