

A block α -circulant based preconditioned MINRES method for wave equations

Xue-lei Lin¹ and Sean Hon²

Abstract

In this work, we propose an absolute value block α -circulant preconditioner for the minimal residual (MINRES) method to solve an all-at-once system arising from the discretization of wave equations. Motivated by the absolute value block circulant preconditioner proposed in [E. McDonald, J. Pestana, and A. Wathen. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 40(2):A1012–A1033, 2018], we propose an absolute value version of the block α -circulant preconditioner. Since the original block α -circulant preconditioner is non-Hermitian in general, it cannot be directly used as a preconditioner for MINRES. Our proposed preconditioner is the first Hermitian positive definite variant of the block α -circulant preconditioner for the concerned wave equations, which fills the gap between block α -circulant preconditioning and the field of preconditioned MINRES solver. The matrix-vector multiplication of the preconditioner can be fast implemented via fast Fourier transforms. Theoretically, we show that for a properly chosen α the MINRES solver with the proposed preconditioner achieves a linear convergence rate independent of the matrix size. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first attempt to generalize the original absolute value block circulant preconditioner in the aspects of both theory and performance the concerned problem. Numerical experiments are given to support the effectiveness of our preconditioner, showing that the expected optimal convergence can be achieved.

Keywords: Block Toeplitz matrix; convergence of MINRES solver; wave equations; absolute value block α -circulant preconditioners

Mathematics Subject Classification: 15B05; 65F08; 65F10; 65M22

1. Introduction

Over the past few decades, the development of parallel-in-time (PinT) solvers for evolutionary partial differential equations (PDEs) has been an active research area. Various PinT methods have been proposed and, among these, two types of solvers are particularly of interest

¹School of Science, Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen 518055, China. E-mail: linxuelei@hit.edu.cn

²The Corresponding Author. Department of Mathematics, Hong Kong Baptist University, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong SAR. E-mail: seanyshon@hkbu.edu.hk

due to their success for a wide range of equations - the parareal method [30] and the multigrid-reduction-in-time [10]. For more on the development of such parallel methods for PDEs, we refer readers to [2–4, 9, 12, 14, 16, 17, 26] and the references therein.

Recently, ever since the inception of the preconditioning method developed in [37], there have been an increasing amount of work on developing effective PinT preconditioners for the all-at-once systems arising from solving evolutionary PDEs (see, e.g., [7, 20, 22, 23, 29]). These methods can be categorized into the so-called all-at-once PDE solvers. In other words, instead of solving the target PDE in a sequential way, they propose a PinT preconditioner for solving the vast all-at-once linear system, which is constructed from stacking all unknowns at each time levels simultaneously. Among these methods, block α -circulant preconditioners have attracted much attention due to their superior performance for a large class of PDEs, including heat equations [28], wave equations [32, 41], and advection-diffusion equations and viscous Burgers' equation [44]. However, block α -circulant preconditioners are nonsymmetric and, therefore, not Hermitian positive definite (HPD). Consequently, they cannot be directly utilized with symmetric preconditioned Krylov subspace solvers such as the minimal residual (MINRES) method. One of the objectives of this work is to bridge this gap, thereby enabling block α -circulant preconditioners to accelerate the convergence rate of the MINRES solver when solving the all-at-once system.

Letting alone the preconditioner used, the MINRES method is only applicable to solving symmetric linear system. Thanks to the symmetrization technique proposed in [36], the all-at-once system can be equivalently converted into a symmetric linear system by applying a reverse-time ordering permutation transformation. In [37], an absolute value block circulant (ABC) preconditioner was proposed for the symmetrized linear system; this preconditioner is HPD and, therefore, suitable for use with the MINRES solver. The numerical results presented in [37] demonstrate that the MINRES solver, when coupled with the ABC preconditioner, is effective for the symmetrized all-at-once system that arises from parabolic equations. Nevertheless, as will be shown from the numerical examples in Section 3 and the explanations in Remarks 1 & 2, MINRES with the ABC preconditioner does not work well for wave equations. Hence, another objective of this work is to improve the performance of the ABC preconditioner.

Inspired by the ABC preconditioning technique, we consider proposing an absolute-value version of the aforementioned block α -circulant preconditioner, which is HPD and thus can be used as a preconditioner of MINRES solver. In fact, our proposed absolute value block α -circulant (ABAC) preconditioner can be seen as an extension of the ABC preconditioner. In other words, when $\alpha = 1$, the ABAC preconditioner reduces to the ABC preconditioner. Like the original block α -circulant preconditioner, the implementation of the proposed ABAC preconditioner is PinT. Theoretically, we show that the MINRES solver with the proposed ABAC preconditioner has a matrix-size independent convergence rate for solving the symmetrized

all-at-once linear system from wave equation when α is properly chosen. Numerical results in Section 3 also show that the ABAC preconditioner outperforms the ABC preconditioner.

More importantly, to the best of our knowledge, our proposed preconditioning method is the first work to show that a nontrivial symmetric positive definite version of block α -circulant matrix can be constructed for the symmetrized the all-at-once system arising from wave equations, providing a positive answer to the open question discussed in [32, Section 3] that the construction and analysis of such a preconditioner is possible. We emphasize that the construction of our proposed preconditioner, involving the use of matrix square root on α -circulant matrices, has rarely been seen in the relevant literature. Through this novel preconditioning idea, we hope to inspire and stimulate a new line of efficient algorithms for solving other more challenging PDEs, further enriching the PinT solver community.

It is worth noting that the use of ABAC preconditioners has recently been applied to dense block lower triangular Toeplitz systems [27]. However, we must emphasize that the theoretical results presented in [27] are not applicable to the wave equation considered in this work. This inapplicability arises because [27, Assumption 1 (ii)] is not satisfied by the matrix \mathcal{T} to be defined in (1.2).

In this work, we are interested in solving the following linear wave equation as a model problem

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt}(x, t) = \Delta u(x, t) + f(x, t), & (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T], \\ u = 0, & (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, T], \\ u(x, 0) = \psi_0, \quad u_t(x, 0) = \psi_1, & x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

For instance, a direct PinT solver was proposed in [13] for (1.1), where the so-called diagonalization technique [33] was used. For more about the existing solvers based on this diagonalization technique for solving the wave equation, we refer to the recent review paper [15].

Unlike a direct solver, we focus on a preconditioned iterative method for the equation in what follows. For solving (1.1), we adopt here the implicit leap-frog finite difference scheme used in [32, 43], which was established and shown in [31] to be unconditionally stable without the requirement of the restrictive Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy (CFL) condition on the mesh step sizes. Specifically, given a positive integer n , we let $\tau = \frac{T}{n}$ be the time step size. Let h denote the step size along each spatial direction and let m denote the number of spatial grid points. For $k = 1, \dots, n - 1$, we have

$$\frac{\mathbf{u}_m^{(k+1)} - 2\mathbf{u}_m^{(k)} + \mathbf{u}_m^{(k-1)}}{\tau^2} = \Delta_h \frac{\mathbf{u}_m^{(k+1)} + \mathbf{u}_m^{(k-1)}}{2} + \mathbf{f}^{(k)},$$

where $\Delta_h \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is the second-order discrete matrix approximating the Laplacian operator Δ in (1.1), $\mathbf{u}_m^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times 1}$ is an approximation to $u(\mathcal{G}_h, k\tau)$, $\mathbf{f}^{(k)} = f(\mathcal{G}_h, k\tau)$, \mathcal{G}_h denoting the

spatial grid points arranged in the lexicographic ordering.

Instead of solving the above equations for $\mathbf{u}_m^{(k)}$ sequentially for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, we consider the following equivalent all-at-once system mn -by- mn (real) nonsymmetric block Toeplitz system

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} L & & & & & \\ -2I_m & L & & & & \\ L & -2I_m & L & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & L & -2I_m & L \end{bmatrix}}{=: \mathcal{T}} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_m^{(1)} \\ \mathbf{u}_m^{(2)} \\ \mathbf{u}_m^{(3)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{u}_m^{(n)} \end{bmatrix}}{=: \mathbf{u}} = \tau^2 \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{f}_m^{(0)}/2 + \Psi_1/\tau + \Psi_0/\tau^2 \\ \mathbf{f}_m^{(1)} - L\Psi_0/\tau^2 \\ \mathbf{f}_m^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{f}_m^{(n-1)} \end{bmatrix}}{=: \mathbf{f}}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $L = I_m - \frac{\tau^2}{2}\Delta_h \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$. Note that I_m denotes the $m \times m$ identity matrix.

Throughout, the discrete negative Laplacian matrix $-\Delta_h$ is assumed HPD and hence L is HPD as well. Such an assumption is easily satisfied when a finite difference method is used on a uniform grid. In a more general case where the spatial domain is irregular and a finite element method is used [8], the identity matrix I_m and $-\Delta_h$ are replaced by the mass matrix and stiffness matrix, respectively.

We remark that for solving the wave equation (1.1) one can apply other discretization schemes and thus obtain different linear systems other than (1.2). For example, [7, 20, 23] concern various time stepping methods while [41] adopts the Numerov method.

Thanks to the symmetrization technique proposed in [36], we consider to rewrite (1.2) as the following equivalent symmetric form

$$\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}\mathbf{u} = \mathcal{Y}\mathbf{f}, \quad (1.3)$$

where

$$\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T} = \begin{bmatrix} & & L & -2I_m & L \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ L & -2I_m & L & & \\ -2I_m & L & & & \\ L & & & & \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1.4)$$

and $\mathcal{Y} = Y_n \otimes I_m$ with $Y_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ being the anti-identity matrix, i.e., $[Y_n]_{j,k} = 1$ if and only if $j+k = n+1$ and $[Y_n]_{j,k} = 0$ elsewhere. Clearly, the monolithic matrix $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}$ is symmetric since L is assumed symmetric.

For the symmetrized matrix $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}$ given in (1.4), we know from [11, Theorem 3.4] and previous

results in [24, 34, 35] that its eigenvalues can be determined from the so-called generating function of \mathcal{T} . According to these results, \mathcal{YT} is symmetric indefinite when n is large enough, which accounts for the use of MINRES instead of a HPD Krylov subspace method like the conjugate gradient method in this work. For complete surveys on generating functions as well as other properties of block multilevel Toeplitz matrices, we refer readers to [5, 6, 18, 19, 38] and the references therein.

Proposed in [32], the following block α -circulant preconditioner can be constructed as an approximation to \mathcal{T} :

$$\mathcal{C}_\alpha = \begin{bmatrix} L & & \alpha L & -2\alpha I_m \\ -2I_m & L & & \alpha L \\ L & -2I_m & L & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & L & -2I_m & L \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1.5)$$

Clearly, \mathcal{C}_α is not symmetric and, thus, not HPD. However, Krylov subspace solvers (e.g., MINRES) for symmetric linear systems typically require an HPD preconditioner for maintaining the short-recurrence property. Therefore, \mathcal{C}_α is not a suitable preconditioner for the symmetric linear system (1.3).

To address this issue of positive definiteness, we first note that \mathcal{C}_α is diagonalizable for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. To see this, we can rewrite \mathcal{C}_α as

$$\mathcal{C}_\alpha = B_1^{(\alpha)} \otimes L + B_2^{(\alpha)} \otimes (-2I_m), \quad (1.6)$$

where

$$B_1^{(\alpha)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & & \alpha \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_2^{(\alpha)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & \alpha \\ 1 & 0 & \\ & 1 & 0 \\ & & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$$

According to [1], $B_1^{(\alpha)}$ and $B_2^{(\alpha)}$ are diagonalizable as follows

$$\begin{aligned} B_j^{(\alpha)} &= D_\alpha^{-1} \mathbb{F} \Lambda_{\alpha,j} \mathbb{F}^* D_\alpha, \quad j = 1, 2, \\ D_\alpha &= \text{diag}(\alpha^{\frac{i-1}{n}})_{i=1}^n, \quad \mathbb{F} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} [\theta_n^{(i-1)(j-1)}]_{i,j=1}^n, \quad \theta_n = \exp\left(\frac{2\pi \mathbf{i}}{n}\right), \quad \mathbf{i} = \sqrt{-1}, \\ \Lambda_{\alpha,j} &= \text{diag}(\lambda_{j,k}^{(\alpha)})_{k=1}^n, \quad j = 1, 2, \quad \lambda_{1,k}^{(\alpha)} = 1 + \alpha^{\frac{2}{n}} \theta_n^{2(k-1)}, \quad \lambda_{2,k}^{(\alpha)} = -2\alpha^{\frac{1}{n}} \theta_n^{k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

With the diagonalization formulas, \mathcal{C}_α ($\alpha \in (0, 1)$) can be shown block diagonalizable as follows

$$\mathcal{C}_\alpha = [(D_\alpha^{-1}\mathbb{F}) \otimes I_m](\Lambda_{\alpha,1} \otimes L + \Lambda_{\alpha,2} \otimes I_m)[(\mathbb{F}^* D_\alpha) \otimes I_m]. \quad (1.7)$$

Since L is HPD, $\Lambda_{\alpha,1} \otimes L + \Lambda_{\alpha,2} \otimes I_m$ is clearly diagonalizable. In other words, \mathcal{C}_α is similar to a diagonalizable matrix and thus \mathcal{C}_α itself is diagonalizable for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. That means for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ there exists an invertible matrix \mathbf{X} and a diagonal matrix $\text{diag}(\mu_i)_{i=1}^{nm}$ such that

$$\mathcal{C}_\alpha = \mathbf{X}^{-1} \text{diag}(\mu_i)_{i=1}^{nm} \mathbf{X}.$$

Thus, we can define a matrix square root of \mathcal{C}_α for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ as follows

$$\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{1/2} = \mathbf{X}^{-1} \text{diag}(\sqrt{\mu_i})_{i=1}^{nm} \mathbf{X}, \quad (1.8)$$

where $\sqrt{\mu_i}$ denotes the principal branch of complex square root of μ_i .

Consequently, we in this work propose the following HPD preconditioner for $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}$:

$$\mathcal{P}_\alpha = (\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{1/2})^T \mathcal{C}_\alpha^{1/2}. \quad (1.9)$$

Then, instead of directly solving $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}\mathbf{u} = \mathcal{Y}\mathbf{f}$, we employ the MINRES solver to solve the following equivalent preconditioned system

$$\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1} \mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}\mathbf{u} = \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1} \mathcal{Y}\mathbf{f}. \quad (1.10)$$

For a real symmetric matrix \mathbf{H} , denote by $|\mathbf{H}|$, the positive semi-definite matrix obtained by replacing eigenvalues of \mathbf{H} with its absolute value.

Remark 1. When $\alpha = 1$, $\mathcal{P}_\alpha = (\mathcal{C}_1^{1/2})^T \mathcal{C}_1^{1/2} = \sqrt{\mathcal{C}_1^T \mathcal{C}_1} = |\mathcal{C}_1|$ reduces to the existing ABC preconditioner proposed in [37] for heat equations. However, as demonstrated by the numerical results in Section 3, \mathcal{P}_1 does not perform well for wave equations. The reason is that the eigenvalues of preconditioned matrix by the ABC preconditioner have outliers away from $\{-1, +1\}$ and the number of outliers is of $\mathcal{O}(m)$, which means the iteration number needed for convergence increases as m increases. This is the motivation for proposing \mathcal{P}_α in this work. As will be shown, Theorem 13 gives choices of $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ so that the MINRES solver for (1.10) has a linear convergence rate independent of h and τ . With guidance of Theorem 13, results in Section 3 show that \mathcal{P}_α outperforms \mathcal{P}_1 for wave equations.

Ultimately, we will show that the preconditioned MINRES solver for the preconditioned system (1.10) achieves a convergence rate independent of τ and h and therefore independent of the matrix size.

This paper is organized as follows. We present our main results in Section 2 in which the

convergence of our proposed preconditioner is analyzed. Numerical tests are given in Section 3 to demonstrate the matrix-size independent convergence rate of the proposed preconditioned MINRES solver.

2. Main results

In this section, we discuss properties of our proposed ABAC preconditioner \mathcal{P}_α defined by (1.9) and the fast implementation for the proposed preconditioned method.

2.1. Preliminaries for convergence analysis of the preconditioned method

In this subsection, we introduce preliminaries for the linear convergence rate analysis of MINRES solver for the preconditioned system.

Denote by $GL(K)$ the set of all $K \times K$ invertible complex matrices. For a square matrix \mathbf{A} , denote by $\sigma(\mathbf{A})$, the spectrum of \mathbf{A} . Define

$$\mathcal{Q}(K) := \{\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times K} \mid \sigma(\mathbf{A}) \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]\}.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{Q}(K) \subset GL(K)$. For a complex number z , denote by $\Re(z)$ and $\Im(z)$, the real part and the imaginary part of z , respectively.

Lemma 1. *For any $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, it holds $\mathcal{C}_\alpha \in \mathcal{Q}(mn) \subset GL(mn)$.*

Proof: See the proof in Appendix A. □

Remark 2. *Clearly, Lemma 1 guarantees that the preconditioner \mathcal{P}_α is invertible. Moreover, from its proof, we see that the eigenvalues of Strang's [40] block circulant preconditioner \mathcal{C}_1 are of form $\mu = 2 \cos(\omega_k)[\lambda \cos(\omega_k) - 1] + \mathbf{i}2 \sin(\omega_k)[\lambda \cos(\omega_k) - 1]$ and some of which are equal to zero when $\lambda \cos(\omega_k) - 1 = 0$. Therefore, such an existing block circulant preconditioner may be singular and thus not applicable in general.*

Denote by $\text{UTT}(\mathbf{v})$, the upper triangular Toeplitz matrix with \mathbf{v} as its first column. Define the i -th order Jordan block $J_i(\lambda)$ as

$$J_i(\lambda) := \begin{cases} \lambda, & i = 1, \\ \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 1 & & \\ & \lambda & \ddots & \\ & & \lambda & 1 \\ & & & \lambda \end{bmatrix} & \in \mathbb{C}^{i \times i}, \quad i > 1. \end{cases}$$

Definition 1. (Matrix function via Jordan canonical form [21, Definition 1.2]) Let $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{ZJZ}^{-1}$ be a Jordan canonical form of a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ with

$$J = \text{blockdiag}(J_{n_i}(\lambda_i))_{i=1}^k, \quad \{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^k \in \sigma(\mathbf{A}), \quad \sum_{i=1}^k n_i = N.$$

For a function g of one complex variable that is sufficiently smooth on each point of $\sigma(\mathbf{A})$, a matrix function is defined by

$$g(\mathbf{A}) := \mathbf{Z} \text{blockdiag}(g(J_{n_i}(\lambda_i)))_{i=1}^k \mathbf{Z}^{-1},$$

where $g(J_{n_i}(\lambda_i))$ is an upper triangular Toeplitz matrix given as

$$g(J_{n_i}(\lambda_i)) = \text{UTT} \left(\left(\frac{g(\lambda_i)}{0!}, \frac{g'(\lambda_i)}{1!}, \dots, \frac{g^{(j)}(\lambda_i)}{j!}, \dots, \frac{g^{(n_i-1)}(\lambda_i)}{(n_i-1)!} \right) \right) \in \mathbb{C}^{n_i \times n_i}.$$

For $z \in \mathbb{C}$, define $s(z)$ as the principal branch of complex square root of z .

Proposition 1. ([39, Example 1.16]) The principal square root function $s(\cdot)$ is holomorphic on $\mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$.

By Definition 1 and Proposition 1, $s(\cdot)$ as a matrix function is well-defined on $\mathcal{Q}(K)$ for any positive integer K .

Denote $\mathbb{C}_+ := \{z \in \mathbb{C} | \Re(z) > 0\}$.

Lemma 2. ([21, Theorem 1.29]) For $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{Q}(K)$ with any positive integer K ,

- (a) there exists a unique matrix \mathbf{B} such that $\mathbf{B}^2 = \mathbf{A}$ and $\sigma(\mathbf{B}) \subset \mathbb{C}_+$;
- (b) the matrix \mathbf{B} is exactly $s(\mathbf{A})$;
- (c) if, additionally, \mathbf{A} is real, then $s(\mathbf{A})$ is real.

Proof: The results of Lemma 2 come from [21, Theorem 1.24] and [21, Theorem 1.29]. \square

Since $\sigma(\mathcal{T}) = \sigma(L) \subset (1, +\infty) \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$, $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{Q}(mn)$. That means $s(\mathcal{T})$ is well defined. In the rest of this paper, we use the notation $\mathcal{T}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ to represent $s(\mathcal{T})$.

Lemma 3. Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{mn \times mn}$ be defined by (1.2). Then,

- (a) $\mathcal{T}^{1/2}$ is invertible;
- (b) $\mathcal{T}^{1/2}$ is a real-valued matrix;
- (c) $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}^{1/2}$ is symmetric.

Proof: As discussed above, $\sigma(\mathcal{T}) \subset (1, +\infty)$. Therefore, $\sigma(\mathcal{T}^{1/2}) \subset (1, +\infty)$, which proves part (a).

Since \mathcal{T} is real-valued, Part (b) of Lemma 3 follows from Part (c) of Lemma 2.

We now show part (c) of Lemma 3. Since $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}$ is symmetric by (1.4) (i.e., $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{Y}^{-1} = \mathcal{T}^T$) and $(\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{Y}^{-1})^{1/2} = \mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}^{1/2}\mathcal{Y}^{-1}$ by [21, Theorem 1.13 (c)], we can see that $(\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{Y}^{-1})^{1/2} = \mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}^{1/2}\mathcal{Y}^{-1} = (\mathcal{T}^T)^{1/2} = (\mathcal{T}^{1/2})^T$, where the last equation follows by [21, Theorem 1.13 (b)]. Thus, we readily have shown that $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}^{1/2} = (\mathcal{T}^{1/2})^T\mathcal{Y} = (\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}^{1/2})^T$. Part (c) is concluded. \square

The following proposition indicates that an ideal preconditioner for $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}$ is the HPD matrix $(\mathcal{T}^{1/2})^T\mathcal{T}^{1/2}$, which can achieve the optimal two-step convergence when MINRES is used due to the fact that the preconditioned matrix has only two distinct eigenvalues ± 1 .

Proposition 2. *Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{mn \times mn}$ be defined by (1.2). Then, $((\mathcal{T}^{1/2})^T\mathcal{T}^{1/2})^{-1}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}$ has only ± 1 as eigenvalues.*

Proof: By Lemma (3) (a), the preconditioner $(\mathcal{T}^{1/2})^T\mathcal{T}^{1/2}$ is invertible. By Lemma (3) (c), we have $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}^{1/2} = (\mathcal{T}^{1/2})^T\mathcal{Y}$ which yields $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}^{-1/2} = (\mathcal{T}^{-1/2})^T\mathcal{Y}$. Then, we consider the following preconditioned matrix

$$\begin{aligned} ((\mathcal{T}^{1/2})^T\mathcal{T}^{1/2})^{-1}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T} &= \mathcal{T}^{-1/2}(\mathcal{T}^{-1/2})^T\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^{-1/2}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}^{-1/2}\mathcal{T} \\ &= \mathcal{T}^{-1/2}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}^{-1/2}\mathcal{T}^{1/2}\mathcal{T}^{1/2} \\ &= \mathcal{T}^{-1/2}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have shown that the preconditioned matrix $((\mathcal{T}^{1/2})^T\mathcal{T}^{1/2})^{-1}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}$ is similar to \mathcal{Y} which is real-valued, symmetric, and orthogonal. Hence, it has only ± 1 as eigenvalues. \square

In other words, Proposition 2 provides a guide on designing an effective preconditioner for $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}$, since in general $(\mathcal{T}^{1/2})^T\mathcal{T}^{1/2}$ is computationally expensive to implement.

In what follows, we shall show that our proposed preconditioner \mathcal{P}_α approximates the ideal preconditioner $(\mathcal{T}^{1/2})^T\mathcal{T}^{1/2}$ in the sense that their difference is a small norm matrix whose magnitude is controlled by the parameter α . Its preconditioning effect becomes apparent since \mathcal{P}_α gets close to $(\mathcal{T}^{1/2})^T\mathcal{T}^{1/2}$ as α approaches zero.

Now, we turn our focus on the following lemmas and proposition, which will be used to show our main result.

For a complex number z , denote by $\Re(z)$ and $\Im(z)$, the real part and the imaginary part of z , respectively.

Similar to Lemma 3, the following lemma on \mathcal{C}_α is needed.

Lemma 4. *Let $\mathcal{C}_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{mn \times mn}$ be defined by (1.5) with $0 < \alpha < 1$. Then,*

- (a) $\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{1/2}$ is a real-valued matrix;
- (b) $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{1/2}$ is symmetric.

Proof: By Lemma 1, $\mathcal{C}_\alpha \in \mathcal{Q}(mn)$. It is well-known that the image $s(\mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0])$ is a subset of \mathbb{C}_+ . Then, by definition of $\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{1/2}$ and by the fact that $\sigma(\mathcal{C}_\alpha) \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$, we have $\sigma(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{1/2}) \subset \mathbb{C}_+$. Then, Lemma 2 implies that $s(\mathcal{C}_\alpha) = \mathcal{C}_\alpha^{1/2}$. Moreover, \mathcal{C}_α is clearly real-valued. Hence, $\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{1/2}$ is real-valued by part (c) of Lemma 2. Part (a) is shown.

The proof of part (b) of Lemma 4 is similar to the proof of part (c) of Lemma 3. We skip it here. \square

2.2. Convergence analysis of the proposed PMINRES method

In this subsection, we show that the MINRES solver for the preconditioned system (1.10) has a linear convergence rate independent of both τ and h .

We first provide the following lemma, which will be used to investigate the convergence rate.

For a square matrix \mathbf{C} , denote by $\sigma(\mathbf{C})$ the spectrum of \mathbf{C} . For a real symmetric matrix \mathbf{H} , denote by $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{H})$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{H})$ the minimal and the maximal eigenvalue of \mathbf{H} , respectively.

Lemma 5. [8, Theorem 6.13] *Let $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ and $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ be a symmetric positive definite matrix and a symmetric nonsingular matrix, respectively. Suppose $\sigma(\mathbf{P}^{-1}\mathbf{A}) \in [-a_1, -a_2] \cup [a_3, a_4]$ with $a_4 \geq a_3 > 0$, $a_1 \geq a_2 > 0$ and $a_1 - a_2 = a_4 - a_3$. Then, the MINRES solver with \mathbf{P} as a preconditioner for the linear system $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 1}$ has a linear convergence as follows*

$$\|\mathbf{r}_k\|_2 \leq 2 \left(\frac{\sqrt{a_1 a_4} - \sqrt{a_2 a_3}}{\sqrt{a_1 a_4} + \sqrt{a_2 a_3}} \right)^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} \|\mathbf{r}_0\|_2,$$

where $\mathbf{r}_k = \mathbf{P}^{-1}\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{P}^{-1}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_k$ denotes the residual vector at the k th iteration with \mathbf{x}_k ($k \geq 1$) being the k th iterative solution by MINRES; \mathbf{x}_0 denotes an arbitrary real-valued initial guess; $\lfloor k/2 \rfloor$ denotes the integer part of $k/2$.

To apply Lemma 5 to (1.10), we will first need to investigate the spectrum of the preconditioned matrix $\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}$. By matrix similarity, we know that

$$\sigma(\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}) = \sigma(\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Hence, it suffices to study the spectral distribution of $\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. To this end, we decompose the preconditioned matrix $\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ as

$$\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2} = \mathcal{Q}_\alpha - \mathcal{E}_\alpha, \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$\mathcal{Q}_\alpha = \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{C}_\alpha\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2}, \quad \mathcal{E}_\alpha = \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{R}_\alpha\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2}, \quad \mathcal{R}_\alpha := \mathcal{C}_\alpha - \mathcal{T}.$$

In the lemma below, we will show that \mathcal{Q}_α is a real symmetric orthogonal matrix (i.e., $\sigma(\mathcal{Q}_\alpha) \subset \{-1, 1\}$) and that \mathcal{E}_α is a small-norm matrix for a properly chosen small α .

Lemma 6. *The matrix $\mathcal{Q}_\alpha = \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2} \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{C}_\alpha \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2}$ is both real symmetric and orthogonal, i.e., $\sigma(\mathcal{Q}_\alpha) \subset \{-1, 1\}$.*

Proof: First, we show that \mathcal{Q}_α is real-valued. Since both $\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2}$ and $(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2})^T$ are real-valued matrices by Lemma 4 (a), $\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1} = \mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2} (\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2})^T$ is also real-valued. Furthermore, \mathcal{P}_α^{-1} itself is a normal equation matrix, so it is HPD. By Lemma 1, we know that \mathcal{P}_α^{-1} is nonsingular. As a result, $\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2}$ being a matrix square root of a real-valued HPD matrix is also real-valued HPD. Hence, $\mathcal{Q}_\alpha = \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2} \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{C}_\alpha \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2}$, which is a product of real-valued matrices, is real-valued.

By Lemma 4 (a) that $(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{1/2})^T \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{C}_\alpha^{1/2}$ and $(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2})^T \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}_\alpha^T \mathcal{Q}_\alpha = \mathcal{Q}_\alpha^2 &= \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2} \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{C}_\alpha \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1} \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{C}_\alpha \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2} \\
&= \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2} \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{C}_\alpha \mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2} (\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2})^T \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{C}_\alpha \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2} \\
&= \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2} \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{C}_\alpha^{1/2} \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{C}_\alpha^{1/2} \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2} \\
&= \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2} (\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{1/2})^T \underbrace{\mathcal{Y}^2}_{=I_{mn}} \mathcal{C}_\alpha^{1/2} \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2} \\
&= \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2} \mathcal{P}_\alpha \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2} \\
&= I_{mn}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, \mathcal{Q}_α is orthogonal.

Since \mathcal{Q}_α is real symmetric and orthogonal, we know that $\sigma(\mathcal{Q}_\alpha) \subset \mathbb{R} \cap \{z : |z| = 1\} = \{-1, 1\}$. The proof is complete. \square

In what follows, we will estimate $\|\mathcal{E}_\alpha\|_2$.

From the proof of Lemma 6, we know that $\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2}$ is real symmetric. Moreover, since \mathcal{R}_α is a real block Toeplitz matrix with symmetric blocks, $\mathcal{Y} \mathcal{R}_\alpha$ is real symmetric. Hence, $\mathcal{E}_\alpha = \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2} \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{R}_\alpha \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2}$ is real symmetric. Let $\rho(\cdot)$ denote the spectral radius of a matrix. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{E}_\alpha\|_2 = \|\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2} \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{R}_\alpha \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2}\|_2 &= \rho(\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2} \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{R}_\alpha \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2}) \\
&= \rho(\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1} \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{R}_\alpha) \\
&\leq \|\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1} \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{R}_\alpha\|_2 \\
&= \|\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2} (\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2})^T \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{R}_\alpha\|_2 \\
&\leq \|\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2} (\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2})^T\|_2 \|\mathcal{Y} \mathcal{R}_\alpha\|_2 = \|\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2}\|_2^2 \|\mathcal{R}_\alpha\|_2. \quad (2.2)
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7. *The principal square root $s(\cdot)$, as a matrix function, is continuous on $\mathcal{Q}(K)$ for any positive integer K .*

Proof: By Proposition 1, $s(\cdot)$ is holomorphic on $\mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$ and thus infinitely differentiable on $\mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$. Then, Lemma 7 is a direct consequence of [21, Theorem 1.19]. The proof is

complete. \square

Define the inverse operation ι as $\iota : \mathbf{A} \in GL(K) \rightarrow \iota(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{A}^{-1} \in GL(K)$ for any positive integer K .

Lemma 8. $\iota(\cdot)$ is a continuous on $\mathcal{Q}(K)$ and $\iota(\mathcal{Q}(K)) \subset \mathcal{Q}(K)$ for any positive integer K .

Proof: It is well-known that the inverse operation $\iota(\cdot)$ is continuous on $GL(K)$. Hence, for $\iota(\cdot)$ is continuous on $\mathcal{Q}(K)$, a subset of $GL(K)$.

It remains to show that the image of $\mathcal{Q}(K)$, under the mapping $\iota(\cdot)$, is a subset of $\mathcal{Q}(K)$. For any $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{Q}(K)$, it holds

$$\sigma(\iota(\mathbf{A})) = \sigma(\mathbf{A}^{-1}) = \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda} \mid \lambda \in \sigma(\mathbf{A}) \right\}.$$

That means, for any $\mu \in \sigma(\iota(\mathbf{A}))$, there exists $z \in \sigma(\mathbf{A})$ such that $\mu = \frac{1}{z}$. Rewrite z as $z = z_r + \mathbf{i}z_i$ with $z_r, z_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Then,

$$\mu = \frac{1}{z} = \frac{1}{z_r + \mathbf{i}z_i} = \frac{z_r - \mathbf{i}z_i}{z_r^2 + z_i^2}.$$

As $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{Q}(K)$, $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$ by definition of $\mathcal{Q}(K)$.

If $z_i = 0$, then $z_r + \mathbf{i}z_i \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$ implies that $z_r > 0$. In such case $\Re(\mu) = \frac{z_r}{z_r^2 + z_i^2} > 0$, which means $\mu \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$.

If $z_i \neq 0$, then $\Im(\mu) = -\frac{z_i}{z_r^2 + z_i^2} \neq 0$, which means $\mu \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$.

To conclude, $\mu \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$. By the generality of μ in $\sigma(\iota(\mathbf{A}))$, we know that $\sigma(\iota(\mathbf{A})) \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$ and thus $\iota(\mathbf{A}) \in \mathcal{Q}(K)$. That means for any $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{Q}(K)$, it holds $\iota(\mathbf{A}) \in \mathcal{Q}(K)$. In other words, $\iota(\mathcal{Q}(K)) \subset \mathcal{Q}(K)$. The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 9. Denote $r(\alpha) := \|s(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1})\|_2^2$ for $\alpha \in [0, 1)$. Then, $r(\cdot)$ is a continuous function on $[0, 1)$.

Proof: Clearly, $r(\alpha)$ can be written in a composite form: $r(\alpha) = \|s \circ \iota \circ M(\alpha)\|_2^2$, where $M(\cdot) : \alpha \in [0, 1) \rightarrow M(\alpha) = \mathcal{C}_\alpha \in \mathcal{Q}(mn)$. To show the continuity of $r(\cdot)$, it suffices to show the continuity of $M(\cdot)$ on $[0, 1)$, the continuity of $\iota(\cdot)$ on the image $M([0, 1))$, the continuity of $s(\cdot)$ on the image $\iota(M([0, 1)))$, and the continuity of $\|\cdot\|_2^2$ on the image $s(\iota(M([0, 1)))$.

$M(\alpha)$ is an affine operator with respect to α and it is clearly continuous on $[0, 1)$.

By Lemma 1, $M([0, 1)) \subset \mathcal{Q}(mn)$. Lemma 8 shows that ι is continuous on $\mathcal{Q}(mn)$ and thus is continuous on the subset $M([0, 1))$.

By Lemma 8, $\iota(M([0, 1))) \subset \iota(\mathcal{Q}(mn)) \subset \mathcal{Q}(mn)$. Lemma 7 shows that $s(\cdot)$ is continuous on $\mathcal{Q}(mn)$ and thus is continuous on the subset $\iota(M([0, 1)))$.

It is well-known that $\|\cdot\|_2^2$ is continuous on the whole space $\mathbb{C}^{mn \times mn}$. Hence, $\|\cdot\|_2^2$ is continuous on $s(\iota(M([0, 1])))$.

To conclude, $r(\cdot)$ is continuous on $[0, 1)$. The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 10.

$$c_0 := \sup_{\alpha \in (0, 1/2]} \|\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2}\|_2^2 < +\infty.$$

Proof: Recall from Lemma 1 that $\mathcal{C}_\alpha \in \mathcal{Q}(mn)$ for each $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then, by Lemma 8, we have $\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1} = \iota(\mathcal{C}_\alpha) \in \mathcal{Q}(mn)$ for each $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Hence, by Lemma 2, we see that there exists a unique matrix \mathbf{B} such that $\mathbf{B}^2 = \mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1}$ and $\sigma(\mathbf{B}) \subset \mathbb{C}_+$.

In fact, both $\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2}$ and $s(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1})$ are valid candidates of \mathbf{B} . To see this, we firstly note that $(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2})^2 = \mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1}$. Moreover, it is well-known that the image $s(\mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0])$ is a subset of \mathbb{C}_+ . Then, by definition of $\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{1/2}$ and by the fact that $\sigma(\mathcal{C}_\alpha) \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$, we see that $\sigma(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{1/2}) \subset \mathbb{C}_+$. That means for each $\mu \in \sigma(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2})$, there exists $\lambda \in \sigma(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{1/2}) \subset \mathbb{C}_+$ such that $\mu = \frac{1}{\lambda}$. Rewrite λ as $\lambda = \lambda_r + \mathbf{i}\lambda_i$ with $\lambda_r, \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Then,

$$\mu = \frac{1}{\lambda} = \frac{\lambda_r - \mathbf{i}\lambda_i}{\lambda_r^2 + \lambda_i^2}.$$

Since $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$, $\lambda_r > 0$. Hence, $\Re(\mu) = \frac{\lambda_r}{\lambda_r^2 + \lambda_i^2} > 0$. That means $\mu \in \mathbb{C}_+$. By the generality of μ in $\sigma(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2})$, we know that $\sigma(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2}) \subset \mathbb{C}_+$. Hence, $\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2}$ is a valid candidate of \mathbf{B} .

On the other hand, by Lemma 2, we know that $s(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1})$ is also a valid candidate of matrix \mathbf{B} . Then, the uniqueness of \mathbf{B} implies that $s(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1}) = \mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2}$ for each $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Therefore, $r(\alpha) = \|s(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1})\|_2^2 = \|\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2}\|_2^2$ for each $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Therefore,

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0, 1/2]} \|\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2}\|_2^2 = \sup_{\alpha \in (0, 1/2]} r(\alpha) \leq \sup_{\alpha \in [0, 1/2]} r(\alpha).$$

As shown in Lemma 9, we know that $r(\cdot)$ is continuous on the compact set $[0, 1/2]$. A continuous function on a compact set has a finite upper bound. Therefore,

$$\sup_{\alpha \in (0, 1/2]} \|\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2}\|_2^2 \leq \sup_{\alpha \in [0, 1/2]} r(\alpha) < +\infty.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Definition 2. A function $g : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}$ between two topological spaces \mathbb{X} and \mathbb{Y} is said to be continuous if and only if for every open set $\mathbb{V} \subset \mathbb{Y}$, the inverse image

$$g^{-1}(\mathbb{V}) := \{X \in \mathbb{X} | g(X) \in \mathbb{V}\},$$

is an open subset of \mathbb{X} .

Lemma 11. [25, Corollary 6.3.4] For $N \times N$ Hermitian matrices \mathbf{H} and \mathbf{E} , if $\hat{\lambda}$ is an eigenvalue of $\mathbf{H} + \mathbf{E}$, then there exists an eigenvalue λ of \mathbf{H} such that

$$|\lambda - \hat{\lambda}| \leq \|\mathbf{E}\|_2.$$

The following lemma indicates that the spectrum of the preconditioned matrix $\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}$ is located in a disjoint interval excluding the origin.

Lemma 12. For $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$, we have

$$\sigma(\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}) \subset [-1 - \alpha c_1, -1 + \alpha c_1] \cup [1 - \alpha c_1, 1 + \alpha c_1],$$

where $c_1 > 0$ independent of α is given as follows

$$c_1 = c_0 \left(\sqrt{\|L\|_2^2 + 1} + 1 \right),$$

with c_0 given in Lemma 10.

Proof: By matrix similarity and (2.1), we have $\sigma(\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}) = \sigma(\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1/2}) = \sigma(\mathcal{Q}_\alpha - \mathcal{E}_\alpha)$. Since both \mathcal{Q}_α and $-\mathcal{E}_\alpha$ are Hermitian, Lemma 11 is applicable. In other words, for $\hat{\lambda} \in \sigma(\mathcal{Q}_\alpha - \mathcal{E}_\alpha)$, there exists $\lambda \in \sigma(\mathcal{Q}_\alpha)$ such that $|\hat{\lambda} - \lambda| \leq \|\mathcal{E}_\alpha\|_2$. By Lemma 6, we know that either $\lambda = 1$ or $\lambda = -1$. That means either $|\hat{\lambda} - 1| \leq \|\mathcal{E}_\alpha\|_2$ or $|\hat{\lambda} + 1| \leq \|\mathcal{E}_\alpha\|_2$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}) &= \sigma(\mathcal{Q}_\alpha - \mathcal{E}_\alpha) \\ &\subset [-1 - \|\mathcal{E}_\alpha\|_2, -1 + \|\mathcal{E}_\alpha\|_2] \cup [1 - \|\mathcal{E}_\alpha\|_2, 1 + \|\mathcal{E}_\alpha\|_2]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

Hence, it suffices to show that $\|\mathcal{E}_\alpha\|_2 \leq c_1\alpha$. By (2.2) and Lemma 10, we have

$$\|\mathcal{E}_\alpha\|_2 \leq \|\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2}\|_2^2 \|\mathcal{R}_\alpha\|_2 \leq c_0 \|\mathcal{R}_\alpha\|_2.$$

Notice that

$$\mathcal{R}_\alpha = \alpha \mathcal{R}_1, \quad \mathcal{R}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} L & -2I_m \\ & L \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore, it is straightforward to check that

$$\|\mathcal{R}_\alpha\|_2 = \alpha \|\mathcal{R}_1\|_2 = \alpha \lambda_{\max} \left(\begin{bmatrix} L & -2I_m \\ & L \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L & \\ -2I_m & L \end{bmatrix} \right) = \alpha \left(\sqrt{\|L\|_2^2 + 1} + 1 \right).$$

Then,

$$\|\mathcal{E}_\alpha\|_2 \leq c_0 \|\mathcal{R}_\alpha\|_2 = \alpha c_0 \left(\sqrt{\|L\|_2^2 + 1} + 1 \right) = c_1 \alpha.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Theorem 13. For any constant $\nu \in (0, 1)$, choose $\alpha \in (0, \eta]$ with

$$\eta := \min \left\{ \frac{\nu^2}{c_1}, \frac{1}{2} \right\},$$

where c_1 is defined in Lemma 12. Then, the MINRES solver for the preconditioned system (1.10) has a convergence rate independent of both τ and h , i.e.,

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_k\|_2 \leq 2\nu^{k-1} \|\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_0\|_2, \quad k \geq 1,$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_k = \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1} \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{T} \mathbf{u}_k - \mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1} \mathcal{Y} \mathbf{f}$ denotes the residual vector at k th MINRES iteration with \mathbf{u}_k denoting the k th iterative solution by MINRES; $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_0$ denotes the initial residual vector computed by an arbitrary real-valued initial guess \mathbf{u}_0 .

Proof: By $\alpha \in (0, \eta] \subset (0, 1/2]$ and Lemma 12, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1} \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{T}) &\subset [-1 - \alpha c_1, -1 + \alpha c_1] \cup [1 - \alpha c_1, 1 + \alpha c_1] \\ &\subset \left[-1 - \frac{c_1 \nu^2}{c_1}, -1 + \frac{c_1 \nu^2}{c_1} \right] \cup \left[1 - \frac{c_1 \nu^2}{c_1}, 1 + \frac{c_1 \nu^2}{c_1} \right] \\ &= [-1 - \nu^2, -1 + \nu^2] \cup [1 - \nu^2, 1 + \nu^2], \end{aligned}$$

which together with Lemma 5 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_k\|_2 &\leq 2 \left(\frac{\sqrt{(1 + \nu^2)^2} - \sqrt{(1 - \nu^2)^2}}{\sqrt{(1 + \nu^2)^2} + \sqrt{(1 - \nu^2)^2}} \right)^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} \|\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_0\|_2 \\ &= 2 (\nu^2)^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} \|\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_0\|_2 \\ &\leq 2 (\nu^2)^{\frac{k}{2} - \frac{1}{2}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_0\|_2 = 2\nu^{k-1} \|\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_0\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

Remark 3. As indicated in Theorem 13, the convergence rate bound (i.e., ν) of the MINRES solver can be taken as a constant independent of matrix size. For such a fixed ν , the corresponding η needs to be of $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{c_1})$, where c_1 defined in Lemma 12 depends on both c_0 and $\|L\|_2$. Clearly, $\|L\|_2$ depends on m (the number of spatial grid points). Meanwhile, c_0 defined in Lemma 10 depends on n (the number of time steps). To summarize, setting $\eta = \min \{\nu^2/c_1, 1/2\}$ for some constant $\nu \in (0, 1)$ and taking $\alpha \in (0, \eta]$ leads to a matrix-size independent convergence rate bound of the MINRES solver.

2.3. Implementations

We begin by discussing the computation of $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}\mathbf{v}$ for any given vector \mathbf{v} . Since \mathcal{T} is a sparse matrix, computing the matrix-vector product $\mathcal{T}\mathbf{v}$ only requires linear complexity of $\mathcal{O}(mn)$. As the action of \mathcal{Y} is a simple reordering of entries that poses virtually no work, computing $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}\mathbf{v}$ needs the same complexity. Alternatively, due to the fact that \mathcal{T} itself is a block Toeplitz matrix, it is well-known that $\mathcal{T}\mathbf{v}$ (and hence $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}\mathbf{v}$) can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(mn \log n)$ operations using fast Fourier transforms and the required storage is of $\mathcal{O}(mn)$.

Now, we discuss how to efficiently invert \mathcal{P}_α , based on similar arguments discussed in, for instance, [28, Section 4]. The invertibility of \mathcal{P}_α is guaranteed for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, which will be proven in the next section. In each iteration of MINRES, it is required to compute $\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1}\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2}(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2})^T\mathbf{y}$ for any given vector \mathbf{y} .

Note that \mathcal{C}_α is composed of the α -circulant matrices $B_j^{(\alpha)} = D_\alpha^{-1}\mathbb{F}^*\Lambda_{\alpha,j}\mathbb{F}D_\alpha$, $j = 1, 2$, where $\Lambda_{\alpha,j} = \text{diag}(\lambda_{j,k}^{(\alpha)})_{k=1}^n$ with $\lambda_{1,k}^{(\alpha)} = 1 + \alpha^{\frac{2}{n}}\theta_n^{2(k-1)}$ and $\lambda_{2,k}^{(\alpha)} = -2\alpha^{\frac{1}{n}}\theta_n^{k-1}$. Also, $D_\alpha = \text{diag}(\alpha^{\frac{i-1}{n}})_{i=1}^n$ and $\mathbb{F} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}[\theta_n^{(i-1)(j-1)}]_{i,j=1}^n$ with $\theta_n = \exp(\frac{2\pi i}{n})$ and $\mathbf{i} = \sqrt{-1}$. Considering (1.6) and the eigendecomposition of $L = U\Lambda U^T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2})^T &= ((B_1^{(\alpha)} \otimes L + B_2^{(\alpha)} \otimes (-2I_m))^{-1/2})^T \\ &= ((D_\alpha^{-1}\mathbb{F}^*\Lambda_{\alpha,1}\mathbb{F}D_\alpha \otimes U\Lambda U^T + D_\alpha^{-1}\mathbb{F}^*\Lambda_{\alpha,2}\mathbb{F}D_\alpha \otimes (-2I_m))^{-1/2})^T \\ &= (D_\alpha^{-1}\mathbb{F}^* \otimes U)^{-T} ((\Lambda_{\alpha,1} \otimes \Lambda + \Lambda_{\alpha,2} \otimes (-2I_m))^{-1/2})^T (\mathbb{F}D_\alpha \otimes U^T)^{-T}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the product $(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2})^T\mathbf{y}$ for a given vector \mathbf{y} can be implemented via the following three steps:

- Step 1: Compute $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = (\mathbb{F}D_\alpha \otimes U^T)^{-T}\mathbf{y}$;
- Step 2: Compute $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = ((\Lambda_{\alpha,1} \otimes \Lambda + \Lambda_{\alpha,2} \otimes (-2I_m))^{-1/2})^T\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$;
- Step 3: Compute $\mathbf{z} = (D_\alpha^{-1}\mathbb{F}^* \otimes U)^{-T}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$.

When the spatial grid is uniformly partitioned, the orthogonal matrix U becomes a (multi-dimension) discrete sine transform matrix \mathbb{S} . In this case, both Steps 1 & 3 can be computed efficiently via fast Fourier transforms and fast sine transforms in $\mathcal{O}(mn \log n)$ operations. As for Step 2, the required computations take $\mathcal{O}(nm)$ operations since the matrix involved is a simple diagonal matrix.

In effect, the overall product $\mathcal{P}_\alpha^{-1}\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2}(\mathcal{C}_\alpha^{-1/2})^T\mathbf{y}$ can be computed by repeating the above three-step procedure two times.

In the case where the underlying differential equation involves variable coefficients, the implementation of our proposed preconditioner can be carried out in a similar way as in the constant-coefficient case. A related discussion will be given in Section 3.

Certainly, when α is small, computations involving D_α^{-1} may introduce stability concerns as extensively studied in [13, 42]. However, as examined in [32], it appears that this does not significantly impact convergence when a Krylov subspace method is used with a properly chosen small α independent of the meshes. The stability implications of small α warrant further investigation, which we will address in our future research.

3. Numerical examples

In this section, we demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed preconditioner. All numerical experiments are carried out using Octave 8.2.0 on a Dell R640 server equipped with dual Xeon Gold 6246R 16-Cores 3.4GHz CPUs, 512GB RAM running Ubuntu 20.04 LTS. The CPU time in seconds is measured using the Octave built-in functions `tic/toc`. Both Steps 1 & 3 in Section 2.3 are implemented by the functions `dst` (discrete sine transform) and `fft` (fast Fourier transform). Furthermore, the MINRES solver used is implemented using the built-in function `minres` on Octave. We choose a zero initial guess and a stopping tolerance of 10^{-6} based on the reduction in relative residual norms for the MINRES solver tested unless otherwise indicated.

We adopt the notation MINRES- \mathcal{P}_α to represent the MINRES solver with the proposed preconditioner \mathcal{P}_α . We will test our proposed MINRES- \mathcal{P}_α method for wave equation compare its performance against MINRES- \mathcal{P}_1 proposed in [37] and MINRES- I_{mn} (i.e., the non-preconditioned case). We set α to 10^{-6} for MINRES- \mathcal{P}_α , a value empirically chosen based on a series of experiments aimed at optimizing performance. The stopping criterion of for all MINRES solvers tested in this section is set as $\|\mathbf{r}_k\|_2 \leq 10^{-6}$, where \mathbf{r}_k denotes the residual vector at k -th iteration step.

Denote by ‘Iter’, the iteration numbers for solving a linear system by an iterative solver. Denote by ‘CPU’, the computational time in unit of second. Denote by ‘DoF’, the degree of freedom, i.e., the number of unknowns. For ease of statement, we take the same spatial step size h for each spatial direction in all examples appearing in this section. We define the error as

$$E_{\tau,h} := \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} h^{d/2} \|(\mathbf{u}_{\text{iter}}^{(k)} - u(\mathcal{G}_h, k\tau))\|_2,$$

where d is the spatial dimension, h denotes the spatial step size along each spatial direction, $\mathbf{u}_{\text{iter}}^{(k)}$ denotes the iterative solution of the linear system at k -th time level, and $u(\mathcal{G}_h, k\tau)$ denotes the values of exact solution $u(\cdot, k\tau)$ on the spatial grids.

In the following two examples, as discussed, the concerned wave equations is discretized using the finite difference scheme proposed in [31], which was shown to be unconditionally convergent with a second-order accuracy without imposing the CFL condition.

Example 1. In this example, we consider a wave equation (1.1) with

$$d = 2, \quad \Omega = (0, 1) \times (0, 1), \quad T = 1, \quad -\psi_1(x) = \psi_0(x) = x_1(x_1 - 1)x_2(x_2 - 1),$$

$$f(x, t) = \exp(-t)(x_1(x_1 - 1)x_2(x_2 - 1) - 2(x_1(x_1 - 1) + x_2(x_2 - 1))).$$

The exact solution of Example 1 is given by

$$u(x, t) = \exp(-t)x_1(x_1 - 1)x_2(x_2 - 1).$$

Applying the solver aforementioned for Example 1, the corresponding numerical results are presented. Table 1 shows that (i) MINRES- \mathcal{P}_α is considerably more efficient than MINRES- \mathcal{P}_1 in terms of computational time and iteration number, while the accuracy of both solvers are roughly the same; (ii) the convergence rate (i.e., the iteration number) of MINRES- \mathcal{P}_α does not deteriorate as the temporal or spatial grids get refined. Evidently, the optimality of the proposed preconditioner is demonstrated, namely, the complexity of the proposed MINRES- \mathcal{P}_α is merely proportional to the complexity of the matrix-vector multiplication.

As shown in Table 2, the errors by all solvers adopted are roughly the same. In fact, the errors of all solvers tested in this section are always roughly the same in each example. For this reason, we will skip the results of $E_{\tau, h}$ in the subsequent example.

Table 1: Iteration numbers and CPU times of MINRES- \mathcal{P}_α , MINRES- \mathcal{P}_1 , and MINRES- I_{mn} for Example 1.

τ	h	DoF	MINRES- \mathcal{P}_α		MINRES- \mathcal{P}_1		MINRES- I_{mn}	
			Iter	CPU(s)	Iter	CPU(s)	Iter	CPU(s)
2^{-4}	2^{-4}	3600	2	0.0059	140	0.21	614	0.12
	2^{-5}	15376	2	0.015	87	0.31	1992	2.10
	2^{-6}	63504	2	0.030	223	1.97	7659	44.38
	2^{-7}	258064	2	0.089	476	12.12	30491	308.83
2^{-5}	2^{-4}	7200	2	0.0089	146	0.27	1204	0.27
	2^{-5}	30752	2	0.019	332	1.64	2574	5.13
	2^{-6}	127008	2	0.049	710	9.35	7897	57.41
	2^{-7}	516128	2	0.16	797	37.34	29386	564.35
2^{-6}	2^{-4}	14400	2	0.013	198	0.67	3388	2.75
	2^{-5}	61504	2	0.026	556	4.49	4695	25.13
	2^{-6}	254016	2	0.084	1567	36.79	9331	84.19
	2^{-7}	1032256	2	0.31	6498	625.95	27664	1138.95
2^{-7}	2^{-4}	28800	2	0.017	236	1.17	11632	22.26
	2^{-5}	123008	2	0.049	804	10.19	13062	87.66
	2^{-6}	508032	2	0.014	3334	151.62	17164	314.98
	2^{-7}	2064512	2	0.83	8445	2233.43	34255	2941.73

Table 2: Errors of MINRES- \mathcal{P}_α , MINRES- \mathcal{P}_1 , and MINRES- I_{mn} for Example 1.

τ	h	DoF	$E_{\tau,h}$		
			MINRES- \mathcal{P}_α	MINRES- \mathcal{P}_1	MINRES- I_{mn}
2^{-4}	2^{-4}	3600	3.04e-4	3.04e-4	3.04e-4
	2^{-5}	15376	3.04e-4	3.05e-4	3.05e-4
	2^{-6}	63504	3.05e-4	3.05e-4	3.05e-4
	2^{-7}	258064	3.05e-4	3.05e-4	3.05e-4
2^{-5}	2^{-4}	7200	7.67e-5	7.70e-5	7.70e-5
	2^{-5}	30752	7.68e-5	7.71e-5	7.71e-5
	2^{-6}	127008	7.69e-5	7.71e-5	7.71e-5
	2^{-7}	516128	7.69e-5	7.71e-5	7.71e-5
2^{-6}	2^{-4}	14400	1.87e-5	1.93e-5	1.93e-5
	2^{-5}	61504	1.88e-5	1.93e-5	1.93e-5
	2^{-6}	254016	1.88e-5	1.93e-5	1.93e-5
	2^{-7}	1032256	1.88e-5	1.93e-5	1.93e-5
2^{-7}	2^{-4}	28800	3.62e-6	4.83e-6	4.89e-6
	2^{-5}	123008	3.62e-6	4.84e-6	4.99e-6
	2^{-6}	508032	3.63e-6	4.84e-6	5.03e-6
	2^{-7}	2064512	3.63e-6	4.84e-6	5.06e-6

For the wave equation with variable diffusion coefficients given below in (3.1), we adopt the same discretization scheme as the one used in Section 1.

$$\begin{cases} u_{tt}(x, t) = \nabla(a(x)\nabla u(x, t)) + f(x, t), & (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T], \\ u = 0, & (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, T], \\ u(x, 0) = \psi_0, \quad u_t(x, 0) = \psi_1, & x \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

where $a(x)$ is a known positive function. Similar to (1.2), the following time-space linear system is obtained from (3.1):

$$\begin{bmatrix} L_a & & & & & & \\ -2I_m & L_a & & & & & \\ L_a & -2I_m & L_a & & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & & \\ & & & L_a & -2I_m & L_a & \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}^{(1)} \\ \mathbf{u}^{(2)} \\ \mathbf{u}^{(3)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{u}^{(n)} \end{bmatrix} = \tau^2 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{f}^{(0)}/2 + \Psi_1/\tau + \Psi_0/\tau^2 \\ \mathbf{f}^{(1)} - L\Psi_0/\tau^2 \\ \mathbf{f}^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{f}^{(n-1)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $L_a = I_m - \frac{\tau^2}{2}\Delta_{a,h} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $\Delta_{a,h}$ is the central difference discretization of $\nabla a(x)\nabla$. Clearly, the proposed preconditioner for the linear system (3.2) is not fast invertible since the spatial matrix cannot be diagonalized by the fast sine transform. To remedy this situation, we consider replacing the diffusion coefficient function a with \bar{a} (i.e., the mean value of a on the

4. Conclusions

We have proposed a novel PinT preconditioner \mathcal{P}_α for the symmetrized all-at-once system of wave equations, $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{T}\mathbf{u} = \mathcal{Y}\mathbf{f}$, whose effectiveness is supported by both theory and numerical evidence. Our preconditioner does not only extend the scope of application of the block α circulant preconditioning technique to MINRES solver, but also significantly improves the performance of the ABC preconditioner proposed in [37]. As shown in the numerical tests, our proposed preconditioner improves significantly the original ABC preconditioner proposed in [37] in terms of both CPU time and iteration number. The numerical evidence also substantiates the advantages of our proposed strategy, particularly in scenarios where the spatial grid is uniformly partitioned.

Acknowledgments

The work of Sean Hon was supported in part by the Hong Kong RGC under grant 22300921, a start-up grant from the Croucher Foundation, and a Tier 2 Start-up Grant from Hong Kong Baptist University. The work of Xue-lei Lin was supported by by research grants: 2021M702281 from China Postdoctoral Science Foundation; HA45001143, HA11409084 two start-up Grants from Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen.

References

- [1] Dario A. Bini, Guy Latouche, and Beatrice Meini. *Numerical Methods for Structured Markov Chains*. Oxford University Press, New York, 2005.
- [2] Daniele Bertaccini. A circulant preconditioner for the systems of LMF-based ODE codes. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 22(3):767–786, 2000.
- [3] Daniele Bertaccini and Michael K. Ng. Block ω -circulant preconditioners for the systems of differential equations. *Calcolo*, 40(2):71–90, 2003.
- [4] Daniele Bertaccini and Fabio Durastante. Limited memory block preconditioners for fast solution of fractional PDEs. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 77(2):950–970, 2018.
- [5] Raymond H. Chan and Xiao-Qing Jin. *An Introduction to Iterative Toeplitz Solvers*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2007.
- [6] Raymond H. Chan and Michael K. Ng. Conjugate gradient methods for Toeplitz systems. *SIAM Review*, 38(3):427–482, 1996.
- [7] Federico Danieli and Andrew J. Wathen. All-at-once solution of linear wave equations. *Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications*, page e2386, 2021.

- [8] Howard Elman, David Silvester, and Andy Wathen. *Finite Elements and Fast Iterative Solvers: with Applications in Incompressible Fluid Dynamics*. Oxford University Press, New York, 2004.
- [9] Veselin A. Dobrev, Tzanio Kolev, N. Anders Petersson, and Jacob B. Schroder. Two-level convergence theory for multigrid reduction in time (MGRIT). *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 39(5):S501–S527, 2017.
- [10] Robert D. Falgout, Stephanie Friedhoff, Tzanio V. Kolev, Scott P. MacLachlan, and Jacob B. Schroder. Parallel time integration with multigrid. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 36(6):C635–C661, 2014.
- [11] Paola Ferrari, Isabella Furci, Sean Hon, Mohammad Ayman Mursaleen, and Stefano Serra-Capizzano. The eigenvalue distribution of special 2-by-2 block matrix-sequences with applications to the case of symmetrized Toeplitz structures. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 40(3):1066–1086, 2019.
- [12] Martin J. Gander. 50 years of time parallel time integration. In Thomas Carraro, Michael Geiger, Stefan Körkel, and Rolf Rannacher, editors, *Multiple Shooting and Time Domain Decomposition Methods*, pages 69–113, Cham, 2015.
- [13] Martin J. Gander, Laurence Halpern, Johann Rannou, and Juliette Ryan. A direct rime parallel solver by diagonalization for the wave equation. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 41(1):A220–A245, 2019.
- [14] Martin J. Gander, Laurence Halpern, Juliet Ryan, and Thuy Thi Bich Tran. A direct solver for time parallelization. In Thomas Dickopf, Martin J Gander, Laurence Halpern, Rolf Krause, and Luca F Pavarino, editors, *Domain Decomposition Methods in Science and Engineering XXII*, pages 491–499, Cham, 2016.
- [15] Martin J. Gander, Jun Liu, Shu-Lin Wu, Xiaoqiang Yue, and Tao Zhou. ParaDiag: parallel-in-time algorithms based on the diagonalization technique. *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2005.09158, 2020.
- [16] Martin J. Gander and Martin Neumüller. Analysis of a new space-time parallel multigrid algorithm for parabolic problems. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 38(4):A2173–A2208, 2016.
- [17] Martin J. Gander and Stefan Vandewalle. Analysis of the parareal time-parallel time-integration method. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 29(2):556–578, 2007.

- [18] Carlo Garoni and Stefano Serra-Capizzano. *Generalized Locally Toeplitz Sequences: Theory and Applications*, volume 1. Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [19] Carlo Garoni and Stefano Serra-Capizzano. *Generalized Locally Toeplitz Sequences: Theory and Applications*, volume 2. Springer, Cham, 2018.
- [20] Anthony Goddard and Andy Wathen. A note on parallel preconditioning for all-at-once evolutionary PDEs. *Electronic Transactions on Numerical Analysis*, 51:135–150, 2019.
- [21] Nicholas J. Higham. *Functions of Matrices: Theory and Computation..* Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2008.
- [22] Sean Hon, Po Yin Fung, Jiamei Dong, and Stefano Serra-Capizzano. A sine transform based preconditioned MINRES method for all-at-once systems from constant and variable-coefficient evolutionary PDEs. *Numerical Algorithms*, 2023.
- [23] Sean Hon and Stefano Serra-Capizzano. A block Toeplitz preconditioner for all-at-once systems of linear wave equations. *Electronic Transactions on Numerical Analysis*, 58:177-195, 2023.
- [24] Sean Hon, Mohammad Ayman Mursaleen, and Stefano Serra-Capizzano. A note on the spectral distribution of symmetrized Toeplitz sequences. *Linear Algebra and Its Applications*, 579(2-3):32–50, 2019.
- [25] Roger A. Horn and Charles R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge university press, 2012.
- [26] Graham Horton and Stefan Vandewalle. A space-time multigrid method for parabolic partial differential equations. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 16(4):848–864, 1995.
- [27] Congcong Li, Xuelei Lin, Sean Hon, and Shu-Lin Wu. A preconditioned MINRES method for block lower triangular Toeplitz systems. *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2307.07749, 2023.
- [28] Xue-lei Lin and Michael Ng. An all-at-once preconditioner for evolutionary partial differential equations. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 43(4):A2766–A2784, 2021.
- [29] Xue-lei Lin, Michael K. Ng, and Yajing Zhi. A parallel-in-time two-sided preconditioning for all-at-once system from a non-local evolutionary equation with weakly singular kernel. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 434:110221, 2021.
- [30] Jacques Louis Lions, Yvon Maday, and Gabriel Turinici. A “parareal” in time discretization of PDE’s. *Comptes rendus de l’Académie des sciences. Série 1, Mathématique*, 332(7):661–668, 2001.

- [31] Buyang Li, Jun Liu, and Mingqing Xiao. A fast and stable preconditioned iterative method for optimal control problem of wave equations. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 37(6):A2508–A2534, 2015.
- [32] Jun Liu and Shu-Lin Wu. A fast block α -circulant preconditioner for all-at-once systems from wave equations. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 41(4):1912–1943, 2021.
- [33] Yvon Maday and Einar M. Rønquist. Parallelization in time through tensor-product space-time solvers. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 346, 2008.
- [34] Mariarosa Mazza and Jennifer Pestana. Spectral properties of flipped Toeplitz matrices and related preconditioning. *BIT Numerical Mathematics*, 59:463–482, 2018.
- [35] Mariarosa Mazza and Jennifer Pestana. The asymptotic spectrum of flipped multilevel Toeplitz matrices and of certain preconditionings. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 42(3):1319–1336, 2021.
- [36] Eleanor McDonald, Sean Hon, Jennifer Pestana, and Andy Wathen. Preconditioning for nonsymmetry and time-dependence. Domain Decomposition Methods in Science and Engineering XXIII, *Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering*, volume 116, pages 81–91. Springer International Publishing, 2017.
- [37] Eleanor McDonald, Jennifer Pestana, and Andy Wathen. Preconditioning and iterative solution of all-at-once systems for evolutionary partial differential equations. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 40(2):A1012–A1033, 2018.
- [38] Michael K. Ng. *Iterative Methods for Toeplitz Systems*. Oxford University Press, New York, 2004.
- [39] Michela Petrini, Gianfranco Pradisi, and Alberto Zaffaroni. *A Guide to Mathematical Methods for Physicists: with Problems and Solutions*. World Scientific, 2018
- [40] Gilbert Strang. A proposal for Toeplitz matrix calculations. *Studies in Applied Mathematics*, 74(2):171–176, 1986.
- [41] Yafei Sun, Shu-Lin Wu , and Yingxiang Xu. A parallel-in-time implementation of the Numerov method for wave equations. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 90, 20, 2022.
- [42] Shu-Lin Wu. Toward parallel coarse grid correction for the parareal algorithm. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 40:A1446–A1472, 2020.

- [43] Shu-Lin Wu and Jun Liu. A parallel-in-time block-circulant preconditioner for optimal control of wave equations. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 42(3):A1510–A1540, 2020.
- [44] Shu-Lin Wu and Tao Zhou. Parallel implementation for the two-stage SDIRK methods via diagonalization. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 428:110076, 2021.

Appendix A Proof of Lemma 1

Proof: When $\alpha = 0$, $\mathcal{C}_\alpha = \mathcal{T}$. In such case, $\sigma(\mathcal{C}_\alpha) = \sigma(\mathcal{T}) = \sigma(L) \subset (1, +\infty) \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$. Hence, $\mathcal{C}_0 \in \mathcal{Q}(mn)$.

It remains to focus on the case $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. We recall from (1.7) that

$$\sigma(\mathcal{C}_\alpha) = \sigma(\Lambda_{\alpha,1} \otimes L + \Lambda_{\alpha,2} \otimes I_m).$$

Hence, for any $\mu \in \sigma(\mathcal{C}_\alpha)$ ($\alpha \in (0, 1)$), there exists $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $\lambda \in \sigma(L) \subset (1, +\infty)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= \lambda \lambda_{1,k}^{(\alpha)} + \lambda_{2,k}^{(\alpha)} \\ &= \lambda - 2\alpha^{\frac{1}{n}} \theta_n^{(k-1)} + \lambda \alpha^{\frac{2}{n}} \theta_n^{2(k-1)} \\ &= \lambda - 2\alpha^{\frac{1}{n}} \cos(\omega_k) + \lambda \alpha^{\frac{2}{n}} \cos(2\omega_k) - 2\alpha^{\frac{1}{n}} \mathbf{i} \sin(\omega_k) + \lambda \alpha^{\frac{2}{n}} \mathbf{i} \sin(2\omega_k) \\ &= \lambda - 2\alpha^{\frac{1}{n}} \cos(\omega_k) + \lambda \alpha^{\frac{2}{n}} (2 \cos^2(\omega_k) - 1) + \mathbf{i} 2\alpha^{\frac{1}{n}} \sin(\omega_k) [\lambda \alpha^{\frac{1}{n}} \cos(\omega_k) - 1] \\ &= \lambda(1 - \alpha^{\frac{2}{n}}) + 2\alpha^{\frac{1}{n}} \cos(\omega_k) [\lambda \alpha^{\frac{1}{n}} \cos(\omega_k) - 1] + \mathbf{i} 2\alpha^{\frac{1}{n}} \sin(\omega_k) [\lambda \alpha^{\frac{1}{n}} \cos(\omega_k) - 1], \end{aligned}$$

where $\omega_k = \frac{2\pi(k-1)}{n}$. We now show $\mu \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$ case by case.

If $\cos(\omega_k) < 0$, then

$$\Re(\mu) = \lambda(1 - \alpha^{\frac{2}{n}}) + 2\alpha^{\frac{1}{n}} \cos(\omega_k) [\lambda \alpha^{\frac{1}{n}} \cos(\omega_k) - 1] > \lambda(1 - \alpha^{\frac{2}{n}}) > 0,$$

which implies $\mu \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$.

If $\cos(\omega_k) = 0$, then

$$\Re(\mu) = \lambda(1 - \alpha^{\frac{2}{n}}) > 0,$$

which implies $\mu \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$.

If $\frac{1}{\lambda \alpha^{\frac{1}{n}}} > \cos(\omega_k) > 0$ and $\cos(\omega_k) \neq 1$, then $\Im(\mu) \neq 0$. If $\cos(\omega_k) = 1$, then $\Re(\mu) = \lambda(1 - \alpha^{\frac{2}{n}}) + 2\alpha^{\frac{1}{n}}(\lambda \alpha^{\frac{1}{n}} - 1) = (\alpha^{\frac{1}{n}} - 1)^2 + (\lambda - 1)(\alpha^{\frac{2}{n}} + 1) > 0$. That means $\mu \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$ when $\frac{1}{\lambda \alpha^{\frac{1}{n}}} > \cos(\omega_k) > 0$.

If $\cos(\omega_k) = \frac{1}{\lambda \alpha^{\frac{1}{n}}}$, then $\mu = \lambda(1 - \alpha^{\frac{2}{n}}) > 0$, which implies $\mu \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$.

If $\cos(\omega_k) > \frac{1}{\lambda\alpha^{\frac{1}{n}}}$, then $\Re(\mu) = \lambda(1 - \alpha^{\frac{2}{n}}) + 2\alpha^{\frac{1}{n}} \cos(\omega_k) [\lambda\alpha^{\frac{1}{n}} \cos(\omega_k) - 1] > 0$, which implies $\mu \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$.

Hence, if $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then for any $\mu \in \sigma(\mathcal{C}_\alpha)$ it holds $\mu \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$. In other words, when $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, it holds that $\mathcal{C}_\alpha \in \mathcal{Q}(mn)$.

To summarize, for any $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, it holds that $\mathcal{C}_\alpha \in \mathcal{Q}(mn)$. The proof is complete. \square