

GMRES using pseudo-inverse for range symmetric singular systems

Kota Sugihara*, Ken Hayami† and Liao Zeyu‡

Abstract

Consider solving large sparse range symmetric singular linear systems $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ which arise, for instance, in the discretization of convection diffusion equations with periodic boundary conditions, and partial differential equations for electromagnetic fields using the edge-based finite element method.

In theory, the Generalized Minimal Residual (GMRES) method converges to the least squares solution for inconsistent systems if the coefficient matrix A is range symmetric, i.e. $R(A) = R(A^T)$, where $R(A)$ is the range space of A .

However, in practice, GMRES may not converge due to numerical instability. In order to improve the convergence, we propose using the pseudo-inverse for the solution of the severely ill-conditioned Hessenberg systems in GMRES. Numerical experiments on semi-definite inconsistent systems indicate that the method is efficient and robust. Finally, we further improve the convergence of the method, by reorthogonalizing the Modified Gram-Schmidt procedure.

Keywords: GMRES method, Pseudo-inverse, Range Restricted GMRES method, Range symmetric singular linear systems, Reorthogonalization

1 INTRODUCTION

Consider the system of linear equations

$$A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b} \quad (1)$$

or the linear least squares problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|\mathbf{b} - A\mathbf{x}\|_2 \quad (2)$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is range symmetric i.e. $R(A) = R(A^T)$ and singular, $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, which arise, for instance, in the discretization of convection diffusion equations with periodic boundary conditions, and partial differential equations of electromagnetic fields using the edge-based finite element method. (1) is called consistent when $\mathbf{b} \in R(A)$, and inconsistent otherwise.

The obvious Krylov subspace methods for solving (1) would be the Generalized Minimal Residual (GMRES) method ([1, 2]) considering the range symmetry $R(A) = R(A^T)$ of the coefficient matrix A , which guarantees the convergence of GMRES to a least squares solution of (2) when $\mathbf{b} \notin R(A)$ without breakdown ([3, 4]). However, for inconsistent systems, GMRES sometimes does not converge well numerically even if $R(A) = R(A^T)$ since the condition number of the Hessenberg matrix becomes extremely large ([3, 5]).

In this paper, we propose using pseudo-inverse to solve the Hessenberg systems in GMRES in order to improve the convergence for inconsistent systems, and prove the convergence theory of the method. Some numerical experiments on semi-definite inconsistent systems indicate that the method is efficient and robust.

For some ill-conditioned and inconsistent systems, the convergence of GMRES using pseudo-inverse is not enough. For such cases, we show that the convergence may be improved by reorthogonalizing the modified Gram-Schmidt procedure.

*kouta.sugihara@gmail.com

†Professor Emeritus, National Institute of Informatics, and The Graduate University for Advanced Studies (SOKENDAI), Email: hayami@nii.ac.jp

‡Department of Informatics, The Graduate University for Advanced Studies (SOKENDAI), 2-1-2, Hitotsubashi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, 101-8430, Japan

2 GMRES

Let \mathbf{x}_0 be the initial approximate solution and $\mathbf{r}_0 = \mathbf{b} - A\mathbf{x}_0$ be the initial residual vector. Denote the Krylov subspace by $K_k(A, \mathbf{r}_0) = \text{span}(\mathbf{r}_0, A\mathbf{r}_0, \dots, A^{k-1}\mathbf{r}_0)$ GMRES is an iterative method which finds an approximate solution \mathbf{x}_k which satisfies

$$\mathbf{x}_k = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{x}_0 + K_k(A, \mathbf{r}_0)} \|\mathbf{b} - A\mathbf{x}\|_2 \quad (3)$$

Denote by V_k , the $n \times k$ matrix with column vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k$ which forms an orthonormal basis of $K_k(A, \mathbf{r}_0)$. An approximate solution $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{x}_0 + K_k(A, \mathbf{r}_0)$ can be obtained as $\mathbf{x}_k = \mathbf{x}_0 + V_k \mathbf{y}_k$ where

$$\mathbf{y}_k = \arg \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^k} \|\beta \mathbf{e}_1 - H_{k+1,k} \mathbf{y}\|_2. \quad (4)$$

Here, $H_{k+1,k} = [h_{i,j}] \in \mathbb{R}^{(k+1) \times k}$, where $AV_k = V_{k+1}H_{k+1,k}$ holds, $\beta = \|\mathbf{r}_0\|_2 = \|\mathbf{b} - A\mathbf{x}_0\|_2$ and $\mathbf{e}_1 = [1, 0, \dots, 0]^T$.

3 GMRES USING PSEUDO-INVERSE

Assume that $R(A) = R(A^T)$ holds. Consider inconsistent systems where $\mathbf{b} \notin R(A)$ in (1). GMRES converges to a least squares solution without breakdown at some step, then GMRES breaks down at the next step, with breakdown through rank deficiency of the least squares problems ([3, 4]). Rank deficiency of the least squares problems means the Hessenberg matrix is rank deficient([3]). Rank deficiency of the Hessenberg matrix means that the smallest singular value $\sigma_k(H_{k+1,k})$ is 0. Hence, numerically, the condition number of the Hessenberg matrix $H_{k,k+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times (k+1)}$ in (4) becomes large for inconsistent systems when GMRES converges to a least squares solution. We apply Givens rotation to $H_{k+1,k} \mathbf{y} = \beta \mathbf{e}_1$, then the upper triangular system $\min \|R_k \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{g}_k\|_2$ is generated. Since the condition number $\kappa(H_{k+1,k}) = \kappa(R)$, if the condition number of $H_{k+1,k}$ is too large, then the backward substitution for $R_k \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{g}_1$ does not work well due to rounding errors. Hence, GMRES does not converge well.

In order to solve this difficulty, we propose using pseudo-inverse for solving (4) as follows.

Algorithm 1 : GMRES using pseudo-inverse (essence)

- 1: Compute $\mathbf{y} = H_{k+1,k}^\dagger \beta \mathbf{e}_1$ where $H_{k+1,k}^\dagger$ is the pseudo-inverse of $H_{k+1,k}$.
- 2: Compute the solution $\mathbf{x}_k = \mathbf{x}_0 + V_k \mathbf{y}$.

Here, $\mathbf{y} = H_{k+1,k}^\dagger \beta \mathbf{e}_1$ is min-norm solution of $\min_{\mathbf{y}_k \in \mathbb{R}^k} \|\beta \mathbf{e}_1 - H_{k+1,k} \mathbf{y}_k\|_2$ ([6]).

$H_{k+1,k}^\dagger$ is given as follows.

Definition 2 : Pseudo-inverse of B

- 1: Let the singular value decomposition of B be $B = U \Sigma V^*$ where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are unitary matrices, $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is the diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are the singular values in descending order.
- 2: Then, $B^\dagger = V \Sigma^\dagger U^*$. Here, $\Sigma = [\sigma_{i,j}] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $\Sigma^\dagger = [\sigma_{i,j}^\dagger] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$. Assume that $\text{rank } \Sigma = r$. Then, $\sigma_{i,i}^\dagger = \sigma_{i,i}^{-1}$ ($i \leq r$), $\sigma_{i,i}^\dagger = 0$ ($i > r$) and $\sigma_{i,j}^\dagger = 0$ ($i \neq j$).

We use pinv in MATLAB for computing the pseudo-inverse. Pinv for the matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is defined as follows.

Algorithm 3 : Pinv in MATLAB

- 1: Let the singular value decomposition of B be $B = U \Sigma V^*$ as above.
- 2: Set the tolerance value tol . The diagonal elements of Σ which are smaller than tol are replaced by zero to give

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, let

$$\tilde{B} := [U_1, U_2] \begin{bmatrix} \sum_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} [V_1, V_2]^* = U_1 \sum_1 V_1^*. \quad (5)$$

where $U = [U_1, U_2]$, $V = [V_1, V_2]$.

3: $\tilde{B}^\dagger := V_1 \sum_1^{-1} U_1^*$.

In **Algorithm 3**, the default value of the tolerance value tol is $\max(m, n) \times \text{eps}(\|B\|_2)$ for $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Here,

- $\max(m, n)$ is m if $m \geq n$, otherwise n .
- $d = \text{eps}(x)$, where x has data type single or double, returns the positive distance d from $|x|$ to the next larger floating-point number of the same precision as x .

$\max(m, n) \times \text{eps}(\|B\|_2)$ is called the numerical rank ([6]).

Here, let $\sigma_1(H_{k+1,k})$ be the largest singular value of $H_{k+1,k}$, and $\sigma_k(H_{k+1,k})$ be the smallest singular value of $H_{k+1,k}$. Table 1 indicates the condition number of $H_{k+1,k}$ and $\tilde{H}_{k+1,k}^\dagger$.

Table 1: Condition number of $H_{k+1,k}$ and $\tilde{H}_{k+1,k}^\dagger$

Matrix	Condition number
$H_{k+1,k}$	$\frac{\sigma_1(H_{k+1,k})}{\sigma_k(H_{k+1,k})}$
$\tilde{H}_{k+1,k}^\dagger$	$\frac{\sigma_1(H_{k+1,k})}{tol}$

As k increases, $\sigma_k(H_{k+1,k})$ decreases. Hence, the condition number of $H_{k+1,k}$, i.e. $\frac{\sigma_1(H_{k+1,k})}{\sigma_k(H_{k+1,k})}$ may become too large. Thus the backward substitution for $R_k \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{g}_1$ may not work well since the condition number $\frac{\sigma_1(H_{k+1,k})}{\sigma_k(H_{k+1,k})}$ is too large. On the other hand, if we truncate the singular values which are smaller than tol using pinv of $H_{k+1,k}$, since $\sigma_k(H_{k+1,k})$ is smaller than tol , we truncate $\sigma_k(H_{k+1,k})$. Then, $\frac{\sigma_1(H_{k+1,k})}{tol}$ is smaller than $\frac{\sigma_1(H_{k+1,k})}{\sigma_k(H_{k+1,k})}$. Hence, GMRES using pseudo-inverse converges better than GMRES.

3.1 Convergence analysis of GMRES using pseudo-inverse

Let $h_{i,j}$ be the (i, j) element of $H_{k+1,k}$. We assume exact arithmetic except for the computation of $h_{i,j}$. That is, we consider the rounding errors for the computation of $h_{i,j}$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let ϵ be the machine epsilon. We define $\|H_{k+1,k}\|_F$ as the Frobenius norm of $H_{k+1,k}$. Assume $R(A) = R(A^T)$ and $\frac{h_{k+1,k}}{\|H_{k+1,k}\|_F} = O(\sqrt{\epsilon})$.*

Then, GMRES using pseudo-inverse determines a solution of $\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|\mathbf{b} - A\mathbf{x}\|_2$.

Proof. In the Arnoldi process,

$$AV_k = V^{k+1} H_{k+1,k} = V^k H_{k,k} + h_{k+1,k} [0, \dots, 0, \mathbf{v}^{k+1}] \quad (6)$$

holds. Here, \mathbf{v}^{k+1} is the $(k+1)$ th column vector of V^{k+1} and $\mathbf{v}^1, \dots, \mathbf{v}^{k+1}$ forms an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{R}^n .

From (6), $\|AV^k\|_F^2 = \|V^k H_{k,k}\|_F^2 + h_{k+1,k}^2$ holds since \mathbf{v}^{k+1} is orthogonal to all columns of $V^k H_{k,k}$ and $\|\mathbf{v}^{(k+1)}\|_2^2 = 1$ holds.

Since $\frac{h_{k+1,k}^2}{\|H_{k+1,k}\|_F^2} = O(\epsilon)$ holds, then we may regard $\frac{h_{k+1,k}^2}{\|H_{k+1,k}\|_F^2} \approx 0$ in finite precision arithmetic. Then, $\|AV^k\|_F^2 \approx \|V^k H_{k,k}\|_F^2$ holds.

$\|AV^k - V^k H_{k,k}\|_F^2 = \|V^k H_{k,k}\|_F^2 + \|AV^k\|_F^2 - 2(AV^k, V^k H_{k,k})$ holds. Here, $(AV^k, V^k H_{k,k}) = (V^k H_{k,k} + h_{k+1,k} [0, \dots, 0, \mathbf{v}^{k+1}], V^k H_{k,k})$ holds. All columns of $[0, \dots, 0, \mathbf{v}^{k+1}]$ are orthogonal to all columns of $V^k H_{k,k}$. Then, $(AV^k, V^k H_{k,k}) = (V^k H_{k,k} + h_{k+1,k} [0, \dots, 0, \mathbf{v}^{k+1}], V^k H_{k,k}) = \|V^k H_{k,k}\|_F^2$ holds.

Since $\|AV^k\|_F^2 \approx \|V^k H_{k,k}\|_F^2$ holds, $\|AV^k - V^k H_{k,k}\|_F^2 = \|V^k H_{k,k}\|_F^2 + \|AV^k\|_F^2 - 2\|V^k H_{k,k}\|_F^2 \approx 0$ holds in finite precision arithmetic. Then, $AV^k \approx V^k H_{k,k}$ holds in finite precision arithmetic.

Refer to the proof of Theorem 1 in [7]. In the present proof, the preconditioner M is an identity matrix and MINRES is replaced by GMRES. Triangular matrix $T_{i,j}$ is replaced by the Hessenberg matrix $H_{i,j}$. In order to prove the theorem, we will analyse GMRES using pseudo-inverse by decomposing it into the $R(A)$ component and the $R(A)^\perp$ component. Using the approach in the proof of Theorem 1 in [7], we can prove that the $R(A)$ component \mathbf{x}_1^k of the solution \mathbf{x}^k of GMRES using pseudo-inverse minimizes the $R(A)$ component of $\|\mathbf{b} - A\mathbf{x}\|_2$ when $\frac{h_{k+1,k}}{\|H_{k+1,k}\|_F} = O(\sqrt{\epsilon})$ holds. Hence, we can prove that the solution \mathbf{x}^k of GMRES using pseudo-inverse minimizes $\|\mathbf{b} - A\mathbf{x}\|_2$ when $\frac{h_{k+1,k}}{\|H_{k+1,k}\|_F} = O(\sqrt{\epsilon})$ holds. \square

If all computations are done in exact arithmetic, GMRES using pseudo-inverse determines a solution of $\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|\mathbf{b} - A\mathbf{x}\|_2$ when $h_{k+1,k} = 0$. When $h_{k+1,k} = 0$ holds, $H_{k,k}$ is singular (See [7], Theorem 1, point a, b; [8], Theorem 4). On the other hand, numerical experiments on some semi-definite inconsistent systems indicate that $\|A\mathbf{r}\|_2/\|A\mathbf{b}\|_2$ becomes very small when the smallest singular value of $H_{k+1,k}$ is very small. However, $h_{k+1,k}$ is not small unlike in theory. We think the numerical result concerning $h_{k+1,k}$ is different from theory due to rounding errors when $\|A\mathbf{r}\|_2/\|A\mathbf{b}\|_2$ becomes very small in the numerical experiments. It is difficult to propose a theory assuming that there are rounding errors in all computations. Thus, we have proposed Theorem 3.1 considering rounding errors for only the computation of $h_{i,j}$ and explained the relation between $\|A\mathbf{r}\|_2/\|A\mathbf{b}\|_2$ and $h_{k+1,k}$.

4 NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS ON EVALUATION OF GMRES USING PSEUDO-INVERSE

In this section, we evaluate the effectiveness of GMRES using pseudo-inverse for range symmetric singular systems. To do so, we compare the performance and the convergence of GMRES using pseudo-inverse, GMRES and Range Restricted GMRES (RRGMRES)[9] by numerical experiments.

We compare GMRES using pseudo-inverse with RRGMRRES since RRGMRRES is better than GMRES for inconsistent range symmetric systems. The initial approximate vector is set to 0. We will actually test on symmetric positive semi-definite systems. We evaluate the performance of each method by $\frac{\|A\mathbf{r}\|_2}{\|A\mathbf{b}\|_2}$ where $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{b} - A\mathbf{x}_k$ and \mathbf{x}_k is an approximate solution at the k -th step.

Computation except for **Algorithm 1** of GMRES using pseudo-inverse were done on a PC with Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-7500U 2.70 GHz CPU, Cent OS ,and double precision floating arithmetic. GMRES and RRGMRRES were coded in Fortran 90 and compiled by Intel Fortran. The method to code GMRES using pseudo-inverse is as follows. Here, $H_{i,j}$ is the Hessenberg matrix and all the column vectors of V_k form an orthonormal basis generated by the Arnoldi process.

1. $H_{i,j}$ and V_k are computed by Fortran 90.
2. Write $H_{i,j}$ and V_k into the ascii formatted files by Fortran 90.
3. Read the files of $H_{i,j}$ and V_k in MATLAB.
4. The pseudo-inverse $\tilde{H}_{i,j}^\dagger$ and the solution $\mathbf{x}_k = \mathbf{x}_0 + V_k \tilde{H}_{k+1,k}^\dagger \beta \mathbf{e}_1$ are computed using pinv of MATLAB.

The version of MATLAB is R2018b.

We will use symmetric numerical positive semi-definite matrices from [10]. The information on these matrices is described in Table 2. Here, n and nnz are the dimension and the number of nonzero elements of the matrices, respectively. rank , $\kappa(A)$ are the dimension of $R(A)$ and the condition number (the ratio of the maximum singular value divided by the minimum singular value), respectively. They were computed by the function **rank** and **svd** of MATLAB, respectively.

For the above four matrices, the right hand side vectors \mathbf{b} were set as follows, where $\mathbf{b}_{N(A)}$ is a unit eigenvector corresponding to the smallest eigenvalue of A .

- $\mathbf{b} = \frac{A \times (1,1,\dots,1)^T}{\|A \times (1,1,\dots,1)^T\|_2} + \mathbf{b}_{N(A)} \times 0.01$

Table 2: Characteristics of the coefficient matrices of the test problems

Matrix	n	nnz	rank	$\kappa(A)$	Application area
msc01050	1,050	26,198	1,049	8.997×10^{15}	structural problem
plat1919	1,919	32,399	1,916	5.365×10^{16}	structural problem
ex32	1,159	11,047	1,158	1.3546×10^{18}	CFD
saylr3	1,000	3,750	998		CFD

Thus, the systems are inconsistent.

Fig. 1 for **msc01050**, Fig. 3 for **plat1919**, Fig. 5 for **ex32** and Fig. 7 for **saylr3** show $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ versus the iteration number for GMRES using pseudo-inverse (blue), GMRES (red) and RRGMRES (green) for an inconsistent problem.

Fig. 2 for **msc01050**, Fig. 4 for **plat1919**, Fig. 6 for **ex32** and Fig. 8 for **saylr3** show $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ versus the iteration number for GMRES using pseudo-inverse (blue), GMRES (red) and RRGMRES (green) for an inconsistent problem.




Figure 1: $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse (blue), GMRES (red), and RRGMRES (green) for an inconsistent problem (**msc01050**)

We observe the following from Fig. 1, Fig. 3, Fig. 5 and Fig. 7.

- The smallest value of $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ of RRGMRES is smaller than the smallest values of $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ of GMRES using pseudo-inverse and GMRES.
- $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ of RRGMRES and GMRES diverges. On the other hand, $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ of GMRES using pseudo-inverse does not diverge, although it oscillates.
- $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ of GMRES using pseudo-inverse drastically decreases each time when the smallest singular value of $H_{k+1,k}$ is truncated by pinv.

In the next section, we will improve the convergence of GMRES using pseudo-inverse by deleting the oscillation.




Figure 2: $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ (blue), $\frac{\sigma_k(H_{k+1,k})}{\sigma_1(H_{k+1,k})}$ (red) and $\frac{h_{j+1,j}}{\|H_{j,j}\|_F}$ (green) vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse for an inconsistent problem (**msc01050**)




Figure 3: $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse (blue), GMRES (red), and RRGMR (\star) for an inconsistent problem (**plat1919**)




Figure 4: $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ (blue), $\frac{\sigma_k(H_{k+1,k})}{\sigma_1(H_{k+1,k})}$ (red) and $\frac{h_{j+1,j}}{\|H_{j,j}\|_F}$ (green) vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse for an inconsistent problem (**plat1919**)




Figure 5: $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse (blue), GMRES (red), and RRGMRES (\star) for an inconsistent problem (**ex32**)




Figure 6: $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ (blue), $\frac{\sigma_k(H_{k+1,k})}{\sigma_1(H_{k+1,k+1})}$ (red) and $\frac{h_{j+1,j}}{\|H_{j,j}\|_F}$ (green) vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse for an inconsistent problem (**ex32**)




Figure 7: $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse (blue), GMRES (red), and RRGMRES (\star) for an inconsistent problem (**saylr3**)




Figure 8: $\frac{\|A\mathbf{r}_j\|_2}{\|A\mathbf{b}\|_2}$ (blue), $\frac{\sigma_k(H_{k+1,k})}{\sigma_1(H_{k+1,k})}$ (red) and $\frac{h_{j+1,j}}{\|H_{j,j}\|_F}$ (green) vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse for an inconsistent problem (**saylr3**)

5 NUMERICAL EXPERIMENT ON GMRES USING PSEUDO-INVERSE AND REORTHOGONALIZATION

We think that $\frac{\|A\mathbf{r}_j\|_2}{\|A\mathbf{b}\|_2}$ of GMRES using pseudo-inverse oscillates since the column vectors of V_k become linearly dependent. Thus, we think that we can remove the oscillation of $\frac{\|A\mathbf{r}_j\|_2}{\|A\mathbf{b}\|_2}$ of GMRES using pseudo-inverse by keeping the linear independence of the column vectors of V_k by reorthogonalization, as proposed in [11].

The algorithm of the reorthogonalization part in the Modified Gram-Schmidt with reorthogonalization is as follows.

Algorithm 4 : Reorthogonalization part of the Modified Gram-Schmidt with reorthogonalization

- 1: $h_{i,j} = (\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j)$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, j$)
- 2: $\mathbf{w} = A\mathbf{v}_j - \sum_{i=1}^j h_{i,j} \mathbf{v}_i$
- 3: $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{j+1} = \mathbf{w} - \sum_{i=1}^j (\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_i) \mathbf{v}_i$
- 4: $h_{j+1,j} = \|\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{j+1}\|_2$
- 5: If $h_{j+1,j} \neq 0$, $\mathbf{v}_{j+1} = \frac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{j+1}}{h_{j+1,j}}$

In **Algorithm 4**, line 3 is the reorthogonalization part. For the same inconsistent systems in the previous section, we will report the numerical results on GMRES using pseudo-inverse with reorthogonalization.

Fig. 9 for **msc01050**, Fig. 13 for **plat1919**, Fig. 17 for **ex32** and Fig. 21 for **saylr3** show $\frac{\|A\mathbf{r}_j\|_2}{\|A\mathbf{b}\|_2}$ versus the iteration number for GMRES using pseudo-inverse with reorthogonalization (blue), GMRES with reorthogonalization (red) and RRGMRRES (green) for an inconsistent problem.

Fig. 10 for **msc01050**, Fig. 14 for **plat1919**, Fig. 18 for **ex32** and Fig. 22 for **saylr3** show $\frac{\|A\mathbf{r}_j\|_2}{\|A\mathbf{b}\|_2}$ (blue), $\frac{\sigma_k(H_{k+1,k})}{\sigma_1(H_{k+1,k})}$ (red), and $\frac{h_{k+1,k}}{\|H_{k,k}\|_F}$ (green) versus the iteration number for GMRES using pseudo-inverse with reorthogonalization for an inconsistent problem.

Fig. 9, Fig. 13, Fig. 17 and Fig. 21 show that the reorthogonalization eliminates the oscillation of GMRES using pseudo-inverse. Fig. 11 and Fig. 12 for **msc01050**, Fig. 15 and Fig. 16 for **plat1919**, Fig. 19 and Fig. 20 for **ex32**, Fig. 23 and Fig. 24 for **saylr3** show the smallest, 2nd smallest, 3rd smallest and 4th smallest singular values of the Hessenberg matrix of GMRES using pseudo-inverse without reorthogonalization and with reorthogonalization.

Fig. 11, Fig. 15, Fig. 19 and Fig. 23 show that the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th smallest singular values of the Hessenberg matrix of GMRES will cluster as GMRES continues. Hence, for example, the 2nd smallest




Figure 9: $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse with reorthogonalization (blue), GMRES with reorthogonalization (red), and RRGMRES (green) for an inconsistent problem (**msc01050**)




Figure 10: $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ (blue), $\frac{\sigma_k(H_{k+1,k})}{\sigma_1(H_{k+1,k})}$ (red) and $\frac{h_{j+1,j}}{\|H_{j,j}\|_F}$ (green) vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse with reorthogonalization for an inconsistent problem (**msc01050**)




Figure 11: The 1st (blue), 2nd (red), 3rd (green) and 4th (cyan) smallest singular values of the Hessenberg matrix vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse for an inconsistent problem (**msc01050**)




Figure 12: The 1st (blue), 2nd (red), 3rd (green) and 4th (cyan) smallest singular values of the Hessenberg matrix vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse with reorthogonalization for an inconsistent problem (**msc01050**)




Figure 13: $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse with reorthogonalization (blue), GMRES with reorthogonalization (red), and RRGMRRES (green) for an inconsistent problem (**plat1919**)




Figure 14: $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ (blue), $\frac{\sigma_k(H_{k+1,k})}{\sigma_1(H_{k+1,k})}$ (red) and $\frac{h_{j+1,j}}{\|H_{j,j}\|_F}$ (green) vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse with reorthogonalization for an inconsistent problem (**plat1919**)




Figure 15: The 1st (blue), 2nd (red), 3rd (green) and 4th (cyan) smallest singular values of the Hessenberg matrix vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse for an inconsistent problem (**plat1919**)




Figure 16: The 1st (blue), 2nd (red), 3rd (green) and 4th (cyan) smallest singular values of the Hessenberg matrix vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse with reorthogonalization for an inconsistent problem (**plat1919**)




Figure 17: $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse with reorthogonalization (blue), GMRES with reorthogonalization (red), and RRGMRES (green) for an inconsistent problem (**ex32**)




Figure 18: $\frac{\|A\mathbf{r}_j\|_2}{\|A\mathbf{b}\|_2}$ (blue), $\frac{\sigma_k(H_{k+1,k})}{\sigma_1(H_{k+1,k})}$ (red) and $\frac{h_{j+1,j}}{\|H_{j,j}\|_F}$ (green) vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse with reorthogonalization for an inconsistent problem (**ex32**)




Figure 19: The 1st (blue), 2nd (red), 3rd (green) and 4th (cyan) smallest singular values of the Hessenberg matrix vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse for an inconsistent problem (**ex32**)




Figure 20: The 1st (blue), 2nd (red), 3rd (green) and 4th (cyan) smallest singular values of the Hessenberg matrix vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse with reorthogonalization for an inconsistent problem (**ex32**)




Figure 21: $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse with reorthogonalization (blue), GMRES with reorthogonalization (red), and RRGMRRES (green) for an inconsistent problem (**saylr3**)




Figure 22: $\frac{\|Ar_j\|_2}{\|Ab\|_2}$ (blue), $\frac{\sigma_k(H_{k+1,k})}{\sigma_1(H_{k+1,k})}$ (red) and $\frac{h_{j+1,j}}{\|H_{j,j}\|_F}$ (green) vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse with reorthogonalization for an inconsistent problem (**saylr3**)




Figure 23: The 1st (blue), 2nd (red), 3rd (green) and 4th (cyan) smallest singular values of the Hessenberg matrix vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse for an inconsistent problem (**saylr3**)




Figure 24: The 1st (blue), 2nd (red), 3rd (green) and 4th (cyan) smallest singular values of the Hessenberg matrix vs. number of iterations for GMRES using pseudo-inverse with reorthogonalization for an inconsistent problem (**saylr3**)

singular value is not truncated and is too small when the smallest singular value is truncated by using pseudo-inverse. Similarly, the 3rd smallest singular value is not truncated and is too small when the 2nd smallest singular value is truncated by using pseudo-inverse. Furthermore, the 4th smallest singular value is not truncated and is too small when the 3rd smallest singular value is truncated by using pseudo-inverse. That is, the next smallest singular value is not truncated and is too small when the smallest singular value is truncated by using pseudo-inverse. Then, $\frac{\|A\mathbf{r}\|_2}{\|A\mathbf{b}\|_2}$ of GMRES using pseudo-inverse without reorthogonalization oscillates since the condition number of the Hessenberg matrix is too large.

On the other hand, Fig. 12 and Fig. 20 show that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th smallest singular values of the Hessenberg matrix of the reorthogonalized GMRES are not small even if the reorthogonalized GMRES continues. Fig. 16 shows that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th smallest singular values are not small when the smallest singular value is truncated by using pseudo-inverse. Shortly before the reorthogonalized GMRES breaks down, the 2nd smallest singular value is truncated and the 3rd, 4th smallest singular are not too small. Fig. 24 shows that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th smallest singular values are not small when the smallest singular value is truncated by using pseudo-inverse. As the reorthogonalized GMRES continues, the 2nd smallest singular value will become too small. After the 2nd smallest singular value is truncated by using pseudo-inverse, the 3rd and 4th smallest singular values are not small.

Since the smallest, 2nd, 3rd and 4th smallest singular values of **mssc01050**, **plat1919**, **ex32** and **saylr3** do not cluster and the column vectors of V_k are kept numerically linearly independent by reorthogonalization, all of the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th smallest singular values of $H_{k+1,k}$ do not cluster. Then, $\frac{\|A\mathbf{r}\|_2}{\|A\mathbf{b}\|_2}$ of GMRES using pseudo-inverse by reorthogonalization does not oscillate.

6 Concluding remark

We introduced GMRES using pseudo-inverse for range symmetric singular systems and proved that this method converges to the least squares solution without breakdown even if the system is inconsistent. Some numerical experiments on semi-definite inconsistent systems indicate that the method is effective and robust. Moreover, we proposed GMRES using pseudo-inverse with reorthogonalization to further stabilize the convergence by suppressing the oscillation of the residual.

7 Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Dr. Keiichi Morikuni for valuable discussions.

References

- [1] Saad Y, Schultz MH. GMRES: A generalized minimal residual algorithm for solving nonsymmetric linear systems. *SIAM J. Sci. Stat. Comput* 1986; **7**:856–869.
- [2] Saad Y. *Iterative methods for sparse linear systems* (2nd edn). SIAM: Philadelphia, PA; 2003.
- [3] Brown P, Walker HF. GMRES on (nearly) singular systems. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* 1997; **18**:37–51.
- [4] Hayami K, Sugihara M. A geometric view of Krylov subspace methods on singular systems. *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.* 2011; **18**:449–469.
- [5] Morikuni K, Rozložník. On GMRES for EP and GP singular systems. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* May 2017; **39**(2). <https://doi.org/10.1137/17M1128216>
- [6] Björck Å, *Numerical Methods for Least Squares Problems*. SIAM: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics; 1996.
- [7] Sugihara K, Hayami K, Zheng N. Right preconditioned MINRES for singular systems. *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.* January 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nla.2277>
- [8] Hayami K, Sugihara K. Corrigendum 2 to: A geometric view of Krylov subspace methods on singular systems. *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.* 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nla.2368>
- [9] Neuman A, Reichel L, and Sadok H. Implementations of range restricted iterative methods for linear discrete ill-posed problems. *Linear Algebra and its Appl.* 15 May 2012; **436**(10):3974–3990.
- [10] Davis TA. SuiteSparse Matrix Collection. <https://sparse.tamu.edu/>
- [11] Liao Z, Hayami K, Morikuni K, and Xiu J.-F. A stabilized GMRES method for singular and severely ill-conditioned systems of linear equations. 2020, (in revision). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.10853>