



Figure 1: The absolute value of \mathbf{D}_3 , i.e. $|\mathbf{D}_3|$, obtained by substituting the eigenvalues in figure 14(c) into the determinant \mathbf{D}_3 in (C1), versus the host to shell viscosity ratio μ_{r3} .

Without loss of clarity, the same symbols are used to denote the corresponding nondimensional terms in (C1). Replacing the element in row 4 and column 10 of the matrix in (C1) with $-\omega$ and eliminating columns 8 and 9 and rows 2 and 6, (C1) reduces to the characteristic equation for the case of a viscous compound droplet suspended in vacuum or in a gas of negligible hydrodynamic effects; further, replacing the element in row 3 and column 1 with $-\omega$ and deleting columns 2 and 3 and rows 1 and 5, (C1) reduces to the characteristic equation for the case of a viscous liquid shell with the core and the host being vacuum or a gas of negligible hydrodynamic effects.

The transcendental equation (C1) is cumbersome. Instead of solving it to get the eigenvalues, we use it as a tool to check the exactness of the eigenvalues obtained with the aid of the spectral method. The strategy is as follows: We substitute the eigenvalues into the determinant \mathbf{D}_3 in (C1) and calculate the corresponding absolute values of \mathbf{D}_3 , denoted by $|\mathbf{D}_3|$. If $|\mathbf{D}_3| = 0$, the eigenvalues are accurate. However, due to the numerical errors in the use of the spectral method, the values of $|\mathbf{D}_3|$ are not exactly zero but remain quite small, as shown in figure 1. In such a case, the eigenvalues obtained by the spectral method are considered to be acceptable in accuracy.

Appendix D. Derivation of the characteristic equation for the thin shell limiting case

In the thin shell limit, the radius ratio $a = 1 - \epsilon$ with $\epsilon \ll 1$. To derive the characteristic equation for this limiting case, we expand the nondimensional characteristic equation (C1) in a Taylor series in the small parameter ϵ (to save

334 smaller determinants, i.e.

$$335 \quad \begin{vmatrix} \omega & 0 \\ 0 & \omega \end{vmatrix} \times \begin{vmatrix} -\Xi_1 & 2l+1 & Z_6 \\ \mu_{r1}(-z_1^2 + 2\Xi_1) & X_5 - Z_5 & -Z_2 \\ -\frac{\rho_{r1}\omega}{l} + 2\mu_{r1}Oh_2\Xi_1 & X_2 + Z_1 + (\gamma_r + 1)\frac{(l-1)(l+2)}{\omega} & -Z_3 \end{vmatrix} = 0. \quad (\text{D } 4)$$

336 Apparently, the solution to the first determinant in (D 4) being equal to zero
 337 is just zero, against the hypothesis $\text{Im}(\omega) \neq 0$. On the other hand, considering
 338 that this determinant corresponds to the positions of the interface amplitudes $\hat{\xi}_1$
 339 and $\hat{\xi}_2$, its structure may suggest that $\hat{\xi}_1 = \hat{\xi}_2$. That is, the interfaces oscillate in
 340 phase and with equal amplitude.

341 The second determinant in (D 4) being equal to zero yields the characteristic
 342 equation for the thin shell limiting case. It is not surprising to find that the
 343 characteristic equation in this limit is identical to (B 58) for the case of a viscous
 344 droplet suspended in a viscous host fluid, except that the interfacial tension here
 345 is the sum of the inner and outer interfacial tensions $\gamma_r + 1$. It turns out that in
 346 the thin shell limiting case the hydrodynamic effects of the shell can be neglected
 347 to the leading order.