

A rational conjugate gradient method for linear ill-conditioned problems

Stefan Kindermann[†] and Werner Zellinger[‡]

June 7, 2023

Abstract

We consider linear ill-conditioned operator equations in a Hilbert space setting. Motivated by the aggregation method, we consider approximate solutions constructed from linear combinations of Tikhonov regularization, which amounts to finding solutions in a rational Krylov space. By mixing these with usual Krylov spaces, we consider least-squares problem in these mixed rational spaces. Applying the Arnoldi method leads to a sparse, pentadiagonal representation of the forward operator, and we introduce the Lanczos method for solving the least-squares problem by factorizing this matrix. Finally, we present an equivalent conjugate-gradient-type method that does not rely on explicit orthogonalization but uses short-term recursions and Tikhonov regularization in each second step. We illustrate the convergence and regularization properties by some numerical examples.

1 Introduction

The setting of this article are linear ill-posed problems stated in Hilbert spaces. That is, given a compact forward operator $A : X \rightarrow Y$ between Hilbert spaces X, Y and data $y \in Y$, a standard idea to find (generalized) solutions x of $Ax = y$ is the least-squares approach:

$$\min_{x \in X} \|Ax - y\|.$$

In this work, we are particular interested in the case that A represents an ill-posed or ill-conditioned forward operator such that direct method usually lead to useless solutions, but regularization has to be employed. One of the most popular regularization methods in this case is Tikhonov regularization that calculates approximate solution to the forward problem by

$$x_\alpha := (A^*A + \alpha I)^{-1}A^*y, \quad (1)$$

with $\alpha > 0$ being a regularization parameter that has to be chosen appropriately. Since this involves solving a linear system, especially in high-dimensional

[†]Industrial Mathematics Institute, Johannes Kepler University Linz, Austria. (kindermann@indmath.uni-linz.ac.at).

[‡]Johann Radon Institute for Computational and Applied Mathematics (RICAM), Austrian Academy of Science, Linz, Austria. (Werner.Zellinger@oeaw.ac.at)

cases, iterative methods are the state-of-the-art, for instance, highly popular are Krylov-space methods (see, e.g., [4]), which in this case lead to applying the conjugate gradient (CG) method [11] to the normal equations (CGNE) $A^*Ax = A^*y$ [3, 8]. By using a discrepancy principle as stopping criterion, this CGNE method acts as a regularization method.

There are two main sources of inspiration for our work. The first one is the so-called aggregation method [2], which improves Tikhonov regularization by constructing linear combinations of several x_{α_i} in (1) and minimizing the least-squares functional over such combinations. This has, e.g., been successfully used in combination with heuristic parameter choice rules [12], inverse problems in geophysics [21], and in particular in domain adaption in learning [5, 16].

It is not difficult to rephrase this approach as least-squares minimization over a rational Krylov space. We discuss this method in Section 2. We show below that the resulting residual is always smaller than that for each individual Tikhonov regularization and also smaller than that of the CGNE method with the same number of steps. However, the aggregation method is non-iterative, and by adding new x_{α_i} , one cannot make efficient use of the previous solutions. The main point of this article is to state a similar (but not equivalent) iterative method that also uses rational Krylov spaces and is practically as efficient as the aggregation method.

To do so, we employ the second source of inspiration, namely the use of mixed rational Krylov spaces that have been investigated by Pranić and Reichel [17]. It has been shown there that by mixing the rational spaces of the aggregation method and the usual Krylov spaces of the CGNE method, one finds short recurrences of the residuals. We introduce the corresponding spaces in Section 2 and prove a pentadiagonal representation of the forward operator in the mixed rational space in Section 3.

As a consequence of the sparse representation, one can find an iterative solution method for the least-squares problem in the mixed rational space by using Arnoldi orthogonalization and essentially an LU -factorization of the sparse matrix. This leads to the Lanczos method defined in Section 4. The drawback of this method is the corresponding memory requirement since all orthogonal basis vectors have to be saved. We therefore propose an equivalent iterative method that does not need this but is based on short recurrence relations and Tikhonov regularization. The corresponding algorithm, called rational CG method, is described in Section 5 and is considered the main contribution of this work. We prove that the method computes the same sequence of approximate solutions as the Lanczos method, which are minimizers of the least-squares problem in the mixed rational Krylov spaces.

Let us remark that we do not prove regularization properties of the Lanczos and rational CG algorithms but leave this for future work. Note that the proof that the CGNE method is a regularization method when combined with the discrepancy principle (see, e.g., the classical monograph [8] or [15, 14]) is quite involved, and we expect the same to be true for the rational counterpart.

Finally, let us mention some related work. As far as the authors know, the proposed rational CG method is original, however, there exist some related methods in the literature. Ruhe [19] has introduced rational Krylov spaces for eigenvalues computations [19]. Güttel [7] has used a quite similar methods as our Lanczos algorithms for solving (not necessarily symmetric) linear problems, but without mixing the spaces. Grimm [6] has studied regularization properties of

such rational CG method, but he uses only constant regularization parameters, whereas we allow varying ones. Compared to Grimm, this makes the algorithm more complicated (we get a three-term recursion in the odd steps), but our method is more flexible and is comparable to the aggregation method. However, the derivation and analysis is also more involved. Pranić et al. [18] proposed a Lanczos-type method for non-symmetric linear equation that is essentially identical to the Lanczos method in this article, which can thus be considered a specialization of that in [18] to the symmetric case.

What is the main novelty in our work compared to [18, 7, 6] is the rational CG method in Section 5, which we regard as a nontrivial extension of the cited work. It is simpler to implement than the Lanczos method and seems to be more robust numerically.

2 The aggregation method and rational Krylov spaces

For notational reasons we introduce the system matrix (or operator) for the normal equations and the corresponding right-hand side:

$$A := A^*A \quad y := A^*y, \quad \bar{A} := AA^*. \quad (2)$$

In the sequel we denote the Hilbert-space inner products in X or Y by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. We consider a sequence of pairwise disjoint nonnegative regularization parameter

$$\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \dots \quad \alpha_i > 0, \quad \alpha_i \neq \alpha_j \quad \text{for } i \neq j.$$

For any such α_i , we define the associated Tikhonov regularization x_{α_i} defined by (1). The method of aggregation by a linear functional strategy of Chen and Pereveryzev [2] is based on improving the approximate solutions x_{α_i} by building finite linear combination of the already computed solutions $(x_{\alpha_i})_{i=1}^N$ and minimizing $\|\sum_{i=1}^N c_i x_{\alpha_i} - x^*\|_X$ over the coefficients c_i and where x^* is an approximation of the true solution x^\dagger using a linear functional strategy. Since this requires an approximation of x^\dagger , which is not available, another variant of this idea is to minimize the residual instead. This has been proposed in [13], [16, Section 4.4] in learning theory. It amounts to minimizing the least-squares functional $\|A \sum_{i=1}^N c_i x_{\alpha_i} - y\|$ over the coefficients c_i yielding an approximation $\sum_{i=1}^N c_i x_{\alpha_i}$ with minimal residual under all such linear combinations. A similar idea is used in Anderson acceleration [1] but with convex combinations of x_{α_i} instead of linear ones.

The motivation for this article is the simple observation that the linear combination of x_{α_i} is an element of a rational Krylov space, and thus the aggregation strategy is a generalization of classical Krylov-space minimization. Let us define the usual Krylov space of dimension n for the above least-squares problem as it is used in the CGNE method (using the notation (2)):

$$\mathcal{K}^n := \text{span}\{y, Ay, A^2y, \dots, A^{n-1}y\}.$$

We define

$$x_{\mathcal{K},n} := \underset{x \in \mathcal{K}^n}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|Ax - y\|. \quad (3)$$

It is well known [8, 3] that $x_{\mathcal{K},n}$ can be calculated recursively by the n th step of the CGNE method.

In contrast, the acceleration method uses elements in the following rational Krylov space: Define

$$f_\alpha(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda + \alpha}.$$

Then, the rational Krylov space of dimension n is given as

$$\mathcal{R}^n = \text{span}\{f_{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{A})y, f_{\alpha_2}(\mathcal{A})y, \dots, f_{\alpha_n}(\mathcal{A})y\}.$$

The acceleration method of [2] computes

$$x_{\mathcal{R},n} := \underset{x \in \mathcal{R}^n}{\text{argmin}} \|Ax - y\|. \quad (4)$$

In contrast to the case for \mathcal{K} and the CGNE method, the solutions here cannot be calculated recursively, but the full Gramian matrix G has to be set up and inverted [16]: Formally, the method computes

$$\begin{aligned} G &:= \langle Ax_{\alpha_i}, Ax_{\alpha_j} \rangle_{i,j=1,N} & g &= \langle y, Ax_{\alpha_i} \rangle_{i=1,N}, \\ c &= G^{-1}g, & x_{\mathcal{R},n} &= \sum_{i=1}^N c_i x_{\alpha_i}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Here, neither the invertibility of the Gramian G nor its well-conditioning is automatically guaranteed but has to be monitored and algorithmically controlled. Although, the computational complexity of the method is mainly dominated by the calculation of the Tikhonov-regularized solutions x_{α_i} , compared to the CGNE method, it has the drawback that whenever we increase the Krylov space by adding new elements x_{α_i} , the full Gramian matrix has to be recalculated and inverted. It does not seem possible to design an equivalent iterative method that computes $x_{\mathcal{R},n}$ from previous solutions.

The main contribution of this article is to show that such an iterative algorithm with a short-term recursion for the acceleration method is, however, possible if we modify the rational Krylov space \mathcal{R}^n slightly. For this we employ a fruitful theorem of Pranić and Reichel [17, 18], according to which short recursions are obtained by alternately mixing the Krylov spaces \mathcal{R}^n and \mathcal{K}^n . Thus, we define the following mixed rational Krylov space:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{KR}^{2k} &:= \text{span}\{y, f_{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{A})y, \mathcal{A}y, f_{\alpha_2}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{A}^2y, \dots, \\ &\quad f_{\alpha_k}(\mathcal{A})y\} \\ \mathcal{KR}^{2k+1} &:= \text{span}\{y, f_{\alpha_1}(\mathcal{A})y, \mathcal{A}y, f_{\alpha_2}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{A}^2y, \dots, \\ &\quad f_{\alpha_k}(\mathcal{A})y, \mathcal{A}^k y\}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Hence,

$$\mathcal{KR}^n = \begin{cases} \mathcal{R}^k \cup \mathcal{K}^k & n = 2k, \\ \mathcal{R}^k \cup \mathcal{K}^{k+1} & n = 2k + 1. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, the spaces \mathcal{KR}^n are build by adding alternately an element of the usual Krylov space \mathcal{K} and the rational Krylov space \mathcal{R} . In the following we refer to the even iteration numbers $n = 2k$ as *rational steps* (where a term

$(\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1}y$ is added) and to the odd iterations $n = 2k + 1$ as *Krylov steps* (where a term $\mathcal{A}^k y$ is added).

In analogy to the above, we define

$$x_{\mathcal{KR},n} := \operatorname{argmin}_{x \in \mathcal{KR}^n} \|Ax - y\|. \quad (7)$$

Algorithm 3 below provides a recursive method, called rational CG, that computes these minimizers recursively.

2.1 Rational representation

Before we develop the method, we study a representation of the Krylov spaces by rational functions: Denote by \mathcal{P}^n the space of all polynomials of degree less than n . (We denote by $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ the floor function, i.e., the rounding to the next smaller integer).

Proposition 1. *The Krylov spaces defined above have the following representation:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}^n &= p_{n-1}(\mathcal{A})y, \quad p_{n-1} \in \mathcal{P}^{n-1}, \\ \mathcal{R}^n &= r_{n-1}(\mathcal{A})y, \quad r_n(x) = \frac{p_{n-1}(x)}{\prod_{i=1}^n (x + \alpha_i)}, \quad p_{n-1} \in \mathcal{P}^{n-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$\mathcal{KR}^n = s_{n-1}(\mathcal{A})y, \quad s_{n-1}(x) = \frac{p_{n-1}(x)}{\prod_{i=1}^k (x + \alpha_i)}, \quad p_{n-1} \in \mathcal{P}^{n-1}, k = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor. \quad (9)$$

Proof. The case for \mathcal{K}^n is obvious as is the case \mathcal{R}^1 . By induction, let the statement be true for \mathcal{R}^{n-1} . Then, by construction, \mathcal{R}^n has a representation $\mathcal{R}^n = \tilde{r}_n(\mathcal{A})y$ with

$$\tilde{r}(x) = \frac{p_{n-2}(x)}{\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (x + \alpha_i)} + \frac{c_n}{x + \alpha_n} = \frac{p_{n-2}(x)(x + \alpha_n) + c_n \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (x + \alpha_i)}{\prod_{i=1}^n (x + \alpha_i)} \quad (10)$$

and $p_{n-2} \in \mathcal{P}^{n-1}$. The denominator represents an element in \mathcal{P}^{n-1} , and, given an arbitrary polynomial $p_{n-1}(x)$ in \mathcal{P}^{n-1} , take $c_n = -\frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (-\alpha_n + \alpha_i)} p(-\alpha_n)$.

Then $p_{n-1}(x) - c_n \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (x + \alpha_i)$ has a root at $-\alpha_n$ and thus can be factorized as $(x + \alpha_n)p_{n-2}(x)$ with $p_{n-2} \in \mathcal{P}^{n-2}$. This allows one to represent $p_{n-1}(x)$ in the form of the numerator of (10). Thus the representation of \mathcal{R}^n is shown. From these results, it follows that the rational function $s_{n-1}(x)$ for \mathcal{KR}^n is given by

$$\begin{aligned} s_{n-1}(x) &= p_{m-1}(x) + \frac{q_{k-1}(x)}{\prod_{i=1}^k (x + \alpha_i)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^k (x + \alpha_i)} (p_{m-1}(x) \prod_{i=1}^k (x + \alpha_i) + q_{k-1}(x)), \end{aligned}$$

where $m = k$ if $n = 2k$ and $m = k + 1$ if $n = 2k + 1$. Thus, in any case the numerator is an element in \mathcal{P}^{n-1} . Conversely, given a polynomial p_{n-1} , a factorization by $\prod_{i=1}^k (x + \alpha_i)$ yields

$$p_{n-1}(x) = \prod_{i=1}^k (x + \alpha_i)q(x) + r(x),$$

where r has degree at most $k - 1$ and q has degree at most $n - 1 - k = m - 1$. Dividing by $\prod_{i=1}^k (x + \alpha_i)$, the representation of s_{n-1} via $\frac{p_{n-1}(x)}{\prod_{i=1}^k (x + \alpha_i)}$ can be written as a sum of elements of the Krylov space and the rational Krylov space. \square

In a similar way, we may define the residual spaces of the normal equations (note that this means $A^*Ax - A^*y$) for the mentioned method. For each of the above Krylov spaces, we define

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{X}} := \text{span}\{\mathcal{A}x - y | x \in \mathcal{X}\} \quad \mathcal{X} \in \{\mathcal{K}^n, \mathcal{R}^n, \mathcal{KR}^n\}. \quad (11)$$

Let \mathcal{P}_1^n be the space of polynomials $p_n(x)$ of degree at most n that satisfy

$$p_n(0) = 1.$$

Proposition 2. *Let $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{K}^n}$, $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}^n}$, $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{KR}^n}$ be the residual spaces in (11). Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{K}^n} &= p_n(\mathcal{A})y, & p_n &\in \mathcal{P}_1^n, \\ \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}^n} &= r_n(\mathcal{A})y, & r_n(x) &= \frac{p_n(x)}{\prod_{i=1}^n (\frac{x}{\alpha_i} + 1)}, & p_n &\in \mathcal{P}_1^n, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{KR}^n} = s_n(\mathcal{A})y, \quad s_n(x) = \frac{p_n}{\prod_{i=1}^k (\frac{x}{\alpha_i} + 1)}, \quad p_n \in \mathcal{P}_1^n, k = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor. \quad (13)$$

Proof. The case for $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{K}^n}$ is obvious as is the case $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}^n}$. The residual space $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}^n}$ consists of functions $\tilde{r}_n(\mathcal{A})y$ with $\tilde{r}_n = xr_{n-1}(x) - 1$ and r_{n-1} as in (8). By dividing with $\sigma := \prod_{i=1}^n \alpha_i$, \tilde{r}_n can be written as in (12) with numerator

$$\tilde{p}_n(x) = \sigma^{-1} p_{n-1}(x)x - \prod_{i=1}^n (\frac{x}{\alpha_i} + 1). \quad (14)$$

Clearly this is an element in \mathcal{P}_1^n . Conversely given any polynomial $\tilde{p}_n(x) \in \mathcal{P}_1^n$ it follows that $\prod_{i=1}^n (\frac{x}{\alpha_i} + 1) - p_n(x)$ has a root at 0 and dividing by x yields a polynomial $p_{n-1}(x)$ as in (14). This verifies the representation. The result for $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}^n}$ is obtained in a similar way by replacing $\prod_{i=1}^n (\frac{x}{\alpha_i} + 1)$ by $\prod_{i=1}^k (\frac{x}{\alpha_i} + 1)$. \square

A consequence is the following useful result: Let $n = 2k$, i.e., a rational step. Then

$$(\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k)^{-1} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{KR}^{n-1}} \subset \mathcal{KR}^n, \quad (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k)^{-1} \mathcal{KR}^{n-1} \subset \mathcal{KR}^n. \quad (15)$$

For a Krylov step $n = 2k + 1$ we have

$$\mathcal{A} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{KR}^{n-1}} \subset \mathcal{KR}^n, \quad \mathcal{A} \mathcal{KR}^{n-1} \subset \mathcal{KR}^n. \quad (16)$$

Note that the same representation holds for the least-squares residual $Ax - y$ but with \mathcal{A} replaced by $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ and y replaced by y . This follows since

$$Af(\mathcal{A})y - y = (\overline{\mathcal{A}}f(\overline{\mathcal{A}}) - 1)y.$$

As a further consequence, we can estimate the residual for the rational various Krylov methods by that of the standard Krylov methods:

Theorem 1. Let $x_{\mathcal{K},n}$, $x_{\mathcal{R},n}$, and $x_{\mathcal{KR},n}$ be defined as in (3), (4), and (7), respectively. Then,

$$\|Ax_{\mathcal{R},n} - y\| \leq \|Ax_{\mathcal{KR},n} - y\| \leq \|Ax_{\mathcal{K},n} - y\|,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|Ax_{\mathcal{K},n} - y\| &\leq \prod_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{\|\bar{\mathcal{A}}\|}{\alpha_i} + 1 \right) \|Ax_{\mathcal{KR},n} - y\| \\ &\leq \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\|\bar{\mathcal{A}}\|}{\alpha_i} + 1 \right) \|Ax_{\mathcal{R},n} - y\|. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We have with the notation in Proposition 2, and by the definition of $x_{\mathcal{K},n}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Ax_{\mathcal{R},n} - y\| &= \inf_{p_n \in \mathcal{P}_1^n} \|\Pi_{i=1}^n (\frac{\bar{\mathcal{A}}}{\alpha_i} + I)^{-1} p_n(\bar{\mathcal{A}}) y\| \\ &\leq \prod_{i=1}^n \|\frac{\bar{\mathcal{A}}}{\alpha_i} + I\|^{-1} \inf_{p_n \in \mathcal{P}_1^n} \|p_n(\bar{\mathcal{A}}) y\| \\ &\leq \inf_{p_n \in \mathcal{P}_1^n} \|p_n(\bar{\mathcal{A}}) y\| = \|Ax_{\mathcal{K},n} - y\|. \end{aligned}$$

The result for $x_{\mathcal{KR},n}$ is obtained in a similar way and so are the opposite directions of the estimates. \square

As an immediate consequence, it follows that n -dimensional linear systems, $A^*A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, can be solved by rational Krylov method in at most n steps, assuming exact arithmetic. In fact, since $\|Ax_{\mathcal{K},n} - y\|$ vanishes after at most n steps, we obtain:

Corollary 1. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be such that $Ax = y$ has a unique solution $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then in at most n steps we have $x_{\mathcal{R},n} = x$ and $x_{\mathcal{KR},n} = x$.

Remark 1. In a similar way we can prove that the least-squares residual for the rational methods $x_{\mathcal{R},n}$ $x_{\mathcal{KR},n}$ are always smaller than that any of the appearing Tikhonov regularization x_{α_i} and the corresponding iterative Tikhonov regularization (cf. [9]).

3 An Arnoldi relation

As mentioned above, the pure rational Krylov spaces \mathcal{R}^n do not allow for a simple iterative computation of the minimizers $x_{\mathcal{R},n}$. This is in contrast to the mixed space \mathcal{KR} , as we will show below. The central observation to obtain this result is a theorem of Pranić and Reichel [17, Theorem 1, 2], according to which the orthonormalized residuals in \mathcal{KR} allow for a short recurrence relation. In fact, the results [17] deal with more general rational functions and also general “mixing” method; the main point is that the length of the recurrence is dominated by the length between polynomial powers \mathcal{A}^k occurring. Since in our definition we have an interlacing of such powers, we can find simple recursive methods for computing minimizers in \mathcal{KR} . Let us note that the Pranić-Reichel theorem has been employed in [18] for finding a Hessenberg-type representation with few off-diagonals via the Arnoldi process of a (not necessarily symmetric) matrix. In the first part we reproduce these results for the (simpler) symmetric

case, and we obtain a similar Arnoldi relation as in [18], which in our case is pentadiagonal by symmetry. In the next section we illustrate the associated Lanczos method. As for the Krylov methods, we have to take care of the (rare) occasion of a breakdown:

Definition 1. Let \mathcal{X} be any of the Krylov spaces $\mathcal{X} \in \{\mathcal{K}^n, \mathcal{R}^n, \mathcal{KR}^n\}$. We say that the respective space \mathcal{X} does not break down at step n if

$$\dim \mathcal{X} = n.$$

The criterion for breakdown is well-known in the Krylov space case and can be extended to the rational cases:

Proposition 3. Let n_{bd} be the smallest iteration number where one of the Krylov spaces $\mathcal{X} \in \{\mathcal{K}^n, \mathcal{R}^n, \mathcal{KR}^n\}$ breaks down, i.e., $n_{bd} - 1 = \dim \mathcal{X} < n_{bd}$. Then $n = n_{bd}$ if and only if y can be written as a linear combination of $n - 1$ eigenvectors of \mathcal{A} .

Proof. If a breakdown occurs, then there must be a linear dependent combination of elements in \mathcal{X} and hence there exist a polynomial p_{n-1} of degree \mathcal{P}^n such that

$$\prod_{i=0}^m (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} p_{n-1}(\mathcal{A})y = 0,$$

where $m = 0$ for \mathcal{K} , $m = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ for \mathcal{KR} and $m = n$ for \mathcal{R} . Since the operator $\prod_{i=0}^m (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)$ does not have a nullspace, in any case we end up with the condition $p_{n-1}(\mathcal{A})y = 0$. By [20, Prop. 6-1, 6.2] this means that \mathcal{K}^n is an $n - 1$ -dimensional invariant subspace, thus any element can be written as a linear combination of $n - 1$ eigenvectors, in particular y can be. Conversely if y can be expressed in this way, we may easily find a polynomial, e.g., $p_{n-1}(\lambda) = \prod_{i=1}^n (\lambda - \lambda_i)$, where λ_i are the eigenvalues of the corresponding eigenvectors. \square

3.1 Arnoldi method and Arnoldi relation

We now construct an orthonormal basis for \mathcal{KR}^n by orthonormalizing the basis elements in the definition by a (modified) Gram-Schmidt method. For the usual case \mathcal{K}^n this is exactly the Arnoldi method. We will show that in the symmetric case this yields a pentadiagonal representation of the operator \mathcal{A} . We discuss Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Arnoldi method for \mathcal{KR} .

1: $q_1 := \frac{y}{\|y\|}$
2: **for** $i = 1 \dots N$ **do**
3:

$$v_i = \begin{cases} (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} q_{i-1} & n = 2k \\ \mathcal{A} q_{i-1} & n = 2k + 1 \end{cases}$$

4: $\tilde{q}_i := v_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \langle v_i, q_j \rangle q_j$ # Gram-Schmidt step
5: $q_i = \frac{\tilde{q}_i}{\|\tilde{q}_i\|}$ # normalization step
6: **end for**

Let us stress that in this method, the next element in the Krylov space \mathcal{KR} is given by either $(\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} q_{i-1}$ or $\mathcal{A} q_{i-1}$ and not as suggested by the definition

by $(\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1}y$ or $\mathcal{A}^k y$. This is motivated by the analogous construction for the usual Krylov space \mathcal{K} and an analogous suggestion in [19, (4.13)]. We have written the algorithm with an usual Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization but the modified Gram-Schmidt method is suited as well (and recommended) since they are mathematically equivalent but the latter is numerically more stable.

Furthermore note that the algorithm is *well-defined* as long as $\|\tilde{q}_i\| \neq 0$ such that the normalization step can be performed. We have the following proposition:

Proposition 4. *The iterations in Algorithm 1 are well defined as long as the Krylov space \mathcal{KR} does not break down up to dimension $n \leq N$. Moreover, in this case, the vectors $(q_i)_{i=1}^n$ build an orthonormal basis for \mathcal{KR}^n .*

Proof. By (15), (16), the vectors v_i are in \mathcal{KR}^i if the $(q_j)_{j=1}^{i-1} \in \mathcal{KR}^{i-1}$. If $v_i \notin \mathcal{KR}^{i-1}$, then \tilde{q}_i will be nonzero and the normalization step can be performed, and the iteration is well defined at $i = n$. If, however, $v_i \in \mathcal{KR}^{i-1}$, that is, $\tilde{q}_i = 0$, we may find a rational function as (9) such that $s_{i-1}(\mathcal{A})y = 0$, and hence as in the proof of Proposition 3 a polynomial p_{i-1} with $p_{i-1}(\mathcal{A})y = 0$, which contradicts the assumption of non-breakdown. Hence, by induction, the $(q_j)_{j=1}^i$ span \mathcal{KR}^i and they are orthonormal by construction. \square

Theorem 2. *Assume that the Arnoldi method in Algorithm 1 does not break down up to index N . Then the matrix*

$$T_{i,j} := \langle q_i, \mathcal{A}q_j \rangle_{i,j=1,N}$$

is pentadiagonal and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} T_{m,2k} &= 0 & \text{for } m = 2k + 2, \dots, N, \\ T_{m,2k+1} &= 0 & \text{for } m = 2k + 3, \dots, N. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let n be a Krylov step, i.e., $n = 2k + 1$. By definition, we have

$$\|\tilde{q}_n\|q_n = \mathcal{A}q_{n-1} - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \langle \mathcal{A}q_{n-1}, q_j \rangle q_j.$$

Taking the inner product with q_m , first with $m > n$ and then with $m = n$ yields, by the orthogonality on the left-hand side, $\delta_{n,m}\|\tilde{q}_n\|$. Thus,

$$\langle q_m, \mathcal{A}q_{n-1} \rangle = 0, \quad m \geq n + 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \langle q_n, \mathcal{A}q_{n-1} \rangle = \|\tilde{q}_n\|.$$

In case of a rational step, i.e., $n = 2k$, we multiply the equation for v_i by $\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I$ to get

$$\|\tilde{q}_n\|(\mathcal{A}q_n + \alpha_k q_n) = q_{n-1} - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \langle (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1}q_{n-1}, q_j \rangle (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)q_j. \quad (17)$$

Now take the inner product with q_m for $m > n + 1$. We prove by induction that

$$\langle q_m, \mathcal{A}q_n \rangle = 0, \quad \text{for } m \geq n + 2, n = 2k.$$

Assume that it holds up to all previous rational steps for $n = 2j$, $j = 1, k - 1$. Let $m = n + 2$. By (17) it follows from the orthogonality and the fact that

$\langle q_m, \mathcal{A}q_j \rangle$ on the right-hand side vanishes by the induction assumption for all rational steps and for the Krylov steps as well by the proof in the first step. Thus T has at most two nonzero lower subdiagonals. Since T is symmetric, the matrix is pentadiagonal with the stated structure. \square

As an illustration, the matrix T has the following form. Denote by $Q_n : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ the following operator that takes linear combinations of the vectors q_i given by the Arnoldi method:

$$Q_n = [q_1 \ \cdots \ q_n]. \quad (18)$$

Then the resulting matrix T has the following structure:

$$T = Q_n^T \mathcal{A} Q_n = \begin{bmatrix} \kappa_1 & \beta_2 & \gamma_3 & & & & & & & \\ \beta_2 & \kappa_2 & \beta_3 & & & & & & & \\ \gamma_3 & \beta_3 & \kappa_3 & \beta_4 & \gamma_5 & & & & & \\ & & \beta_4 & \kappa_4 & \beta_5 & & & & & \\ & & \gamma_5 & \beta_5 & \kappa_5 & \beta_6 & \gamma_7 & & & \\ & & & & \beta_6 & \kappa_6 & \beta_7 & & & \\ & & & & \gamma_7 & \beta_7 & \kappa_7 & \dots & & \\ & & & & & & \dots & \dots & \dots & \end{bmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

That is, a pentadiagonal matrix with zeros in the second diagonal at even indices. One may as well view this as a block-tridiagonal matrix consisting of 2×2 blocks with rank-1 off-diagonal blocks.

We note that a corresponding representation has been established in [18] for the non-symmetric case, where the matrix T has generalized Hessenberg form with several subdiagonals; see, e.g., equation (18) *ibid.* Clearly, in case of symmetric operators, such Hessenberg structure becomes our multi-diagonal form.

4 A Lanczos method

Based on the Arnoldi relations, we can now solve the least-squares problem by exploiting the structure of T . This is analogous to the usual Krylov space methods, where a tridiagonal structure appears, which can be inverted iteratively yielding the Lanczos method. Similar to, e.g., [20, Chpt. 6.7], we extend this idea to our pentadiagonal case.

For simplicity of notation we assume now a finite-dimensional case with \mathcal{A} given by a symmetric $N \times N$ matrix and y a given vector in \mathbb{R}^N . Assume that the Arnoldi method does not break down up to index N .

We define the matrix (respectively operators)

$$T_n = Q_n^T \mathcal{A} Q_n = (T_{i,j})_{i,j=1,m},$$

with Q_n from (18), and we set $Q = Q_N$. It follows that

$$Q^T y = \beta e_1,$$

where e_1 is the first unit vector $e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)^T$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$. By orthogonality, the normal equation $\mathcal{A}x = y$ translates to $Tc = \beta e_1$ where $x = Qc$. Finding the

least-squares minimizer x_n in the Krylov space \mathcal{KR}^n translates to $Q_n^T \mathcal{A}x_n = Q_n^T y$ or

$$T_n c_n = \beta e_1 \quad \text{with} \quad x_n = Q_n c_n. \quad (20)$$

Thus, by the sparse structure of T , we can iteratively solve for x_n , which is the objective of the next section. The result is essentially a generalization of the D-Lanczos method in [20, Section 6.7.1], and we follow a similar analysis as there.

4.1 Solving the pentadiagonal system

Recall that we have shown the following structure: In case of a rational step $n = 2k$:

$$T_n = \begin{bmatrix} T_{n-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \beta_n & \kappa_n \end{bmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

In case of a Krylov step $n = 2k + 1$ we have

$$T_n = \begin{bmatrix} T_{n-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_n & \beta_n & \kappa_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} T_{n-2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta_{n-1} & \gamma_n \\ 0 & \gamma_n & \beta_n & \kappa_n \end{bmatrix} \quad (22)$$

Define the vector $d_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$T_n d_n := e_n, \quad (23)$$

where $e_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the n th unit vector $e_n = (0, \dots, 0, 1)^T$. In the following, we denote the last entry of d_n by τ_n , i.e.,

$$d_n = \begin{bmatrix} * \\ \tau_n \end{bmatrix}. \quad (24)$$

We show that with some $\xi_n \in \mathbb{R}$, we have the recursion

$$c_n = \begin{bmatrix} c_{n-1} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \xi_n d_n. \quad (25)$$

Indeed, at first assume that n is a rational step, i.e., $n = 2k$. Then plugging in (25) into (20), noting that $T_{n-1} c_{n-1} = \beta e_1$ and $T_n d_n = e_n$, yields the condition

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \beta_n c_{n-1;n-1} \end{bmatrix} + \xi_n e_n = 0,$$

where we denote by $c_{n-1;k}$ the k -th entry of the vector c_{n-1} . This gives

$$\xi_n = -\beta_n c_{n-1;n-1} = -\beta_n c_{n-1}^T e_{n-1}.$$

Next, we derive a recursion for d_n . Let σ_n be a real number in the ansatz

$$d_n = \sigma_n \begin{bmatrix} d_{n-1} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \tau_n e_n, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad d_n = \begin{bmatrix} * \\ \sigma_n \tau_{n-1} \\ \tau_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

with $\tau_n, \sigma_n \in \mathbb{R}$. The defining equation for d_n , (23), yields the condition for τ_n, σ_n (noting that $T_{n-1}d_{n-1} = e_{n-1}$ and (21))

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \sigma_n \\ \sigma_n \beta_n d_{n-1;n-1} \end{bmatrix} + \tau_n \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \beta_n \\ \kappa_n \end{bmatrix} = e_n,$$

which can be resolved, noting that $d_{n-1;n-1} = \tau_{n-1}$ by definition, to

$$\sigma_n = -\tau_n \beta_n \quad \sigma_n \beta_n \tau_{n-1} + \tau_n \kappa_n = 1.$$

This yields the recursion

$$\tau_n = \frac{1}{\kappa_n - \beta_n^2 \tau_{n-1}} \quad \sigma_n = -\tau_n \beta_n.$$

Thus, both c_n and d_n can be calculated by a 1-step recursion via (26) and (25).

Next, consider the Krylov step $n = 2k + 1$ (with $n > 1$). Again we show a recursion (25). Plugging this identity into the equation $T_n c_n = \beta e_n$ and noting $T_n d_n = e_n$ yields the condition

$$\xi_n = -\gamma_n c_{n-1;n-2} - \beta_n c_{n-1;n-1} = -\gamma_n c_{n-1}^T e_{n-2} - \beta_n c_{n-1}^T e_{n-1}.$$

The recursion for d_n is now more involved as we need a 2-step recursion. Indeed, we make the ansatz

$$d_n = \sigma_n \begin{bmatrix} d_{n-1} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \tau_n e_n + \eta_n \begin{bmatrix} d_{n-2} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (27)$$

with parameter σ_n, η_n, τ_n , and plug this into (23). The last three rows yield a linear equation for the coefficients σ_n, τ_n, η_n :

$$\sigma_n \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ \beta_n d_{n-1;n-1} + \gamma_n d_{n-1;n-2} \end{bmatrix} + \tau_n \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_n \\ \beta_n \\ \kappa_n \end{bmatrix} + \eta_n \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ d_{n-2;n-2} \beta_{n-1} \\ d_{n-2;n-2} \gamma_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note the identities

$$d_{n-1;n-1} = \tau_{n-1}, \quad d_{n-1;n-2} = \sigma_{n-1} \tau_{n-2}, \quad d_{n-2;n-2} = \tau_{n-2}.$$

The recursion for c_n and d_n is now given by (27) and (25).

Let us now rewrite this recursion in terms of x_n . Define $x_n = Q_n c_n$, and $p_n = Q_n d_n$. Then (25) reads

$$x_n = x_{n-1} + \xi_n p_n, \quad (28)$$

where

$$\xi_n = \begin{cases} -\beta_n x_{n-1}^T q_{n-1} & n = 2k, \\ -\gamma_n x_{n-1}^T q_{n-2} - \beta_n x_{n-1}^T q_{n-1} & n = 2k + 1, \end{cases}$$

whereas the recursion for p_n is in the rational case $n = 2k$:

$$p_n = \sigma_n p_{n-1} + \tau_n q_n. \quad (29)$$

In the Krylov case $n = 2k + 1$, we have

$$p_n = \sigma_n p_{n-1} + \eta_n p_{n-2} + \tau_n q_n. \quad (30)$$

where $\xi_n, \sigma_n, \tau_n, \eta_n$ are calculated by the recursions above. The recursion starts at $n = 1$ by a direct calculation of

$$x_1 = \frac{\langle y, y \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{A}y, y \rangle} y, \quad q_1 = \frac{y}{\|y\|}, \quad \tau_1 = \frac{\langle y, y \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{A}y, y \rangle}, \quad p_1 = \tau_1 q_1.$$

We note that the rational step above for p_n is valid for $n = 2$. The full method for calculating least-squares solutions in \mathcal{KR} is now presented in Algorithm 2 as a pseudo-Matlab code. The routine `GramSchmid(v, Q)` there means a orthogonalization *and* normalization step as in the calculation of q_i via \tilde{q}_i in the Arnoldi method in Algorithm 1.

This algorithm is the implementation of the formulas defined above, and it is well-defined as long as the Krylov space \mathcal{KR} does not break down. The involved divisions, e.g., $\tau = 1/(\kappa - \tau\beta^2)$ or matrix inversion (e.g., M^{-1}) are well-defined in case of non-breakdown in exact arithmetic because T_n is then always invertible, and the formulas are derived from solving (23).

As in the standard case for \mathcal{K} , the iterations of Algorithm 2 satisfy certain orthogonality relations:

Proposition 5. *Define $p_n := p$ in Algorithm 2 at iteration n . Then*

$$\langle \mathcal{A}p_n, p_k \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for } n \neq k.$$

Proof. Note that by construction $p_n = Q_n T_n^{-1} e_n$. Since $T_n = Q_n^T \mathcal{A} Q_n$, we have that $Q_n^T \mathcal{A} Q_n d_n = e_n$ and hence $Q_n^T \mathcal{A} p_n = e_n$. As a consequence, $\mathcal{A} p_n = q_n + \text{span}\{q_j, j > n\}$. Thus, for $k < n$,

$$\langle \mathcal{A}p_n, p_k \rangle = \langle q_n + \text{span}\{q_j, j > n\}, p_k \rangle = 0$$

since $p_k \in \text{span}\{q_1, \dots, q_k\}$ and the orthogonality of q_i . By symmetry, the results holds also for $k > n$. \square

This means that the matrix $\langle \mathcal{A}p_i, p_j \rangle, i, j = 1 \dots, N$, is diagonal.

Proposition 6. *Consider the residual for the normal equations*

$$r_n = \mathcal{A}x_n - y$$

for the iterations $x_n = x$ in Algorithm 2 at iteration n . The Gramian matrix for the residual vectors has the following nonzero entries:

$$R_{i,j} := \langle r_i, r_j \rangle = \begin{bmatrix} * & * & & & & \\ * & * & & & & \\ & & * & * & & \\ & & * & * & & \\ & & & & * & * \\ & & & & * & * \end{bmatrix},$$

i.e., it is tridiagonal with additional zeros in the lower off-diagonals for even and in the upper off-diagonal for odd indices. Moreover, we have

$$\langle r_n, p_i \rangle = 0, \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (31)$$

Algorithm 2 Lanczos Algorithm for \mathcal{KR} .

```

1:  $\mathcal{A} = A^*A$ ,  $y = A^*y$ 
2:  $\tau = \frac{\langle y, y \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{A}y, y \rangle}$ ,  $Q(:, 1) = \frac{y}{\|y\|}$ ,  $p = \tau Q(:, 1)$ ,  $x = \frac{\langle y, y \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{A}y, y \rangle} y$ 
3: for  $n = 2 \dots \text{MAXIT}$  do
4:   if  $n$  is even then                                     # Rational step
5:      $k := \frac{n}{2}$ 
6:      $v = (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} Q(:, n-1)$ 
7:      $q = \text{GramSchmid}(v, Q)$ 
8:      $Q(:, n) = q$ 
9:      $\kappa = q^T \mathcal{A}q$ ,  $\beta = Q(:, n-1)^T \mathcal{A}q$ 
10:     $\tau_{old} = \tau$ 
11:     $\tau = 1/(\kappa - \tau\beta^2)$ 
12:     $\sigma = -\tau\beta$ 
13:     $p_{old} = p$ 
14:     $p = \sigma p + \tau q$ 
15:     $\xi = -\beta x^T Q(:, n-1)$ 
16:     $x = x + \xi p$ 
17:  else                                                     # Krylov step
18:     $v = \mathcal{A}Q(:, n-1)$ 
19:     $q = \text{GramSchmid}(v, Q)$ 
20:     $Q(:, n) = q$ 
21:     $\beta_{old} = \beta$ 
22:     $\kappa = q^T \mathcal{A}q$ ,  $\beta = Q(:, n-1)^T \mathcal{A}q$ ,  $\gamma = Q(:, n-2)^T \mathcal{A}q$ 
23:     $M = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \gamma & 1 \\ 1 & \beta & \tau_{old}\beta_{old} \\ \beta\tau + \gamma\sigma\tau_{old} & \kappa & \tau_{old}\gamma \end{bmatrix}$ 
24:     $\tau_{old} = \tau$ 
25:     $\begin{bmatrix} \sigma \\ \tau \\ \eta \end{bmatrix} = M^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ 
26:     $p_{new} = \sigma p + \eta p_{old} + \tau Q(:, n)$ 
27:     $p_{old} = p$ 
28:     $p = p_{new}$ 
29:     $\xi = -\gamma x^T Q(:, n-2) - \beta x^T Q(:, n-1)$ 
30:     $x = x + \xi p$ 
31:  end if
32: end for

```

Proof. Let $\tilde{c}_n \in \mathbb{R}^N$ be a vector with values c_n at position $1, \dots, n$ and 0 at the rest. By the structure (19), (22), (21) it follows for a rational step that

$$\tilde{r}_n := T\tilde{c}_n - \beta e_1 = \beta_{n+1}e_{n+1} \quad \text{for } n = 2k \quad (32)$$

while in a Krylov step

$$\tilde{r}_n := T\tilde{c}_n - \beta e_1 = \beta_{n+1}e_{n+1} + \gamma_{n+2}e_{n+2} \quad \text{for } n = 2k + 1. \quad (33)$$

Thus in case of $n = 2k$, $\tilde{r}_n^T \tilde{r}_{n+1} = 0$, which verifies the 0 in the first offdiagonals. In any case we have $\tilde{r}_n^T \tilde{r}_{n+k} = 0$ for $k \geq 2$. The claimed matrix structure is now verified by the observation that $r_n = Q\tilde{r}_n$ and the orthogonality of Q .

Identity (31) follows since d_i is a vector of length i , hence $p_i \in \mathcal{KR}^i$, while \tilde{r}_n has zero entries in the first n components. Thus r_n is orthogonal to \mathcal{KR}^n and hence to all p_i . \square

5 The rational CG method

The disadvantage of the previous Lanczos method in Algorithm 2 is that the orthogonal vectors q_i has to be saved, and thus the memory requirement might get large. In this section we state an equivalent algorithm that avoids saving the q_i , and it is directly based on one- and two-step recurrence relations for the vectors p_n and x_n , which have the same meaning as in the previous section. This is analogous to the derivation of the CG method from the D-Lanczos method from the orthogonality relations; cf. [20, Section 6.7].

We consider the iteration (28), (29), and (30): First consider (28): Assume that p_n has been computed, and denote by r_n the residual $\mathcal{A}x_n - y$. Then

$$x_n = x_{n-1} + \xi_n p_n \Rightarrow r_n = r_{n-1} + \xi_n \mathcal{A}p_n.$$

We require that r_n is orthogonal to p_n , hence

$$\xi_n = -\frac{\langle r_{n-1}, p_n \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{A}p_n, p_n \rangle}. \quad (34)$$

Next we consider the iterations for p_n . Rewriting it without usage of the q_i is not so difficult for a Krylov step: Let $n = 2k + 1$ and consider (30). It follows from (32) (after multiplying with Q) that $r_{n-1} \sim q_n$. Thus, the recursion (30) can be replaced by

$$p_n = \sigma_n p_{n-1} + \eta_n p_{n-2} + \tau'_n r_{n-1}, \quad (35)$$

where r_{n-1} is the residual of the previous step and τ'_n is some constant (possibly different from τ_n). To fix the constants, we observe from (34) that p_n may be rescaled by a multiplicative constant without changing the method. Thus we set $\tau'_n = 1$. The other constants are obtained by forcing the orthogonality relations $\langle \mathcal{A}p_i, p_j \rangle \sim \delta_{ij}$ to hold. This yields the iteration for a Krylov step, i.e., $n = 2k + 1$:

$$p_n = -\frac{\langle r_{n-1}, \mathcal{A}p_{n-1} \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{A}p_{n-1}, p_{n-1} \rangle} p_{n-1} - \frac{\langle r_{n-1}, \mathcal{A}p_{n-2} \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{A}p_{n-2}, p_{n-2} \rangle} p_{n-2} + r_{n-1}. \quad (36)$$

The recursion for a rational step $n = 2k$ is more involved. Considering (29), the problem is that q_n does not have a simple expression in terms of residuals. However, by (33), (32), it may be written as a linear combination of r_n and r_{n-1} . From (28) it follows that $r_n = r_{n-1} - \xi_n \mathcal{A}p_n$. Thus p_n can be written as linear combination of p_{n-1} , r_{n-1} , and an implicit term $\mathcal{A}p_n$. Keeping in mind (15) and that p_n should represent an element in \mathcal{KR}^n leads to idea that the factor in front of $\mathcal{A}p_n$ should be an $-\alpha_k^{-1}$. Thus, the form of the rational step should be (again using on rescaling degree of freedom for the factor in front of r_{n-1})

$$p_n = (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} [\rho_n p_{n-1} + r_{n-1}].$$

It remains to fix the factor ρ_n , which is obtained through the orthogonality relations as before. Putting the operator $(\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)$ on the right-hand side yields

$$\langle (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)p_n, p_{n-1} \rangle = \rho_n \langle p_{n-1}, p_{n-1} \rangle + \langle r_{n-1}, p_{n-1} \rangle. \quad (37)$$

Thus, requiring $\langle \mathcal{A}p_n, p_{n-1} \rangle = 0$ and $\langle r_{n-1}, p_{n-1} \rangle = 0$ yields

$$\rho_n = \frac{\alpha_k \langle p_n, p_{n-1} \rangle}{\langle p_{n-1}, p_{n-1} \rangle} = \frac{\alpha_k \langle (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} [\rho_n p_{n-1} + r_{n-1}], p_{n-1} \rangle}{\langle p_{n-1}, p_{n-1} \rangle},$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_n &= \frac{\alpha_k \langle (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} p_{n-1}, r_{n-1} \rangle}{\langle p_{n-1}, p_{n-1} \rangle - \alpha_k \langle (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} p_{n-1}, p_{n-1} \rangle} \\ &= \frac{\alpha_k \langle (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} p_{n-1}, r_{n-1} \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{A}p_{n-1}, (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} p_{n-1} \rangle}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Another equivalent formula for ρ_n is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_n &= \frac{\langle [\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k - \mathcal{A}]p_{n-1}, (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} r_{n-1} \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{A}p_{n-1}, (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} p_{n-1} \rangle} \\ &= \frac{\langle p_{n-1}, r_{n-1} \rangle - \langle \mathcal{A}p_{n-1}, (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} r_{n-1} \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{A}p_{n-1}, (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} p_{n-1} \rangle} \\ &= - \frac{\langle \mathcal{A}p_{n-1}, (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} r_{n-1} \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{A}p_{n-1}, (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} p_{n-1} \rangle}, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

exploiting the orthogonality $\langle p_{n-1}, r_{n-1} \rangle = 0$.

Thus, the formula for p_n can be computed from (38) by the steps

$$\begin{aligned} s_n &:= (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} p_{n-1}, \\ t_n &:= (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} r_{n-1}, \\ p_n &:= \frac{\alpha_k \langle s_n, r_{n-1} \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{A}p_{n-1}, s_n \rangle} s_n + t_n. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2. *The computation of p_n in a rational step thus requires solving for s_n and t_n , i.e., two linear solves with Tikhonov matrix $(\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)$, which is an overhead compared to the Lanczos method above that needs only one. However, we did not find a step that requires only one linear solve. Note, however, that the system matrix (Tikhonov matrix) is in both cases that same, only the right-hand sides differ. In Matlab, this can be computed by the statement*

$$[s_n \ t_n] = (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I) \setminus [p_{n-1} \ r_{n-1}], \quad (40)$$

and we found that it does not require much more additional computation time. Observe that for a direct solver, the main work is in the matrix decomposition of the system matrix, which has to be performed only once per step. Using this for two right-hand sides is then negligible overhead work.

Interestingly, if one insists on using only one linear system solve with one right-hand side per step, then this can be achieved by a formula that uses complex variables. Indeed, ρ_n and the formula for p_n can be rewritten by (39)

$$\begin{aligned} p_n &= \frac{1}{\langle \mathcal{A}p_{n-1}, s_n \rangle} \left[-\langle \mathcal{A}p_{n-1}, t_n \rangle s_n + \langle \mathcal{A}p_{n-1}, s_n \rangle t_n \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\langle \mathcal{A}p_{n-1}, s_n \rangle} \mathcal{I} \left[\langle \mathcal{A}p_{n-1}, \overline{s_n + it_n} \rangle (s_n + it_n) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\overline{s_n + it_n}$ denotes the convex conjugate, \mathcal{I} is the imaginary part, and i the imaginary unit. In this formula, the common factor $\frac{1}{\langle \mathcal{A}p_{n-1}, s_n \rangle}$ can be ignored since a multiplicative factor of p_n does not change the iteration. Moreover, in this formula we only require to calculate $(\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} [p_{n-1} + ir_{n-1}]$, i.e., one linear solves with only one complex right-hand side. In the numerical calculations, however, we did not find much of a benefit of using this formula.

Finally, we are in the position to present the full rational CG algorithm. The only thing remaining open is the initial value for the p -variables, i.e., p_1 . Setting $x_{-1} = 0$ and by (28), gives $p_1 = x$, noting the scaling freedom for the p -variables. Together, we obtain Algorithm 3 for solving the normal equations $\mathcal{A}x = y$.

Let us comment about the well-definedness of the algorithm. As long as the failure criterion $\mathcal{A}p_n = 0$ is not satisfied, the fractions in the calculations are all well-defined: This is obvious for the terms $\langle \mathcal{A}p_n, p_n \rangle$, $\langle \mathcal{A}p_{\text{old}}, p_{\text{old}} \rangle$. The denominator $\langle \mathcal{A}p_n, s_n \rangle$ is well-defined under the non-failure condition since

$$\langle \mathcal{A}p, s_n \rangle = \langle \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)s_n, s_n \rangle = \|\mathcal{A}s_n\|^2 + \alpha_k \langle \mathcal{A}s_n, s_n \rangle,$$

which is 0 if and only if $0 = \mathcal{A}s_n = (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} \mathcal{A}p$. Since $\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I$ has no nullspace, this can only happen if $\mathcal{A}p_n = 0$, which is excluded by the non-failure condition.

Finally, we show that the rational CG method does what it is supposed to do.

Theorem 3. *Denote by x_n, p_n, r_n the respective variables x, p, r at iteration n in Algorithm 3. Then, they satisfy the orthogonality conditions*

$$\langle \mathcal{A}p_n, p_j \rangle = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad \text{and} \quad \langle r_n, p_j \rangle = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (41)$$

As a result, Algorithm 3 computes at iteration n the solution to the least-squares problem in the mixed Krylov space \mathcal{KR}^n (7).

Proof. With the notation in the theorem, at the initialization, we obviously have that $x_1, p_1 \in \mathcal{KR}^1$, and $r_1 \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{KR}^1} \subset \mathcal{KR}^2$. Suppose that $x_{n-1}, p_{n-1} \in \mathcal{KR}^{n-1}$ and $r_{n-1} \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{KR}^{n-1}} \subset \mathcal{KR}^n$. In a Krylov step, it follows immediately that $p_n \in \mathcal{KR}^n$. In a rational step we have by (15) that $p_n \in \mathcal{KR}^n$. Thus, in any case $x_n \in \mathcal{KR}^n$ and $r_n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{KR}^n} \subset \mathcal{KR}^{n+1}$. By induction we have proven that

$$x_n, p_n \in \mathcal{KR}^n \quad r_n \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{KR}^n}.$$

Algorithm 3 Rational CG method for \mathcal{KR} .

```

1:  $\mathcal{A} = A^*A$ ,  $y = A^*y$ 
2:  $x = \frac{\langle y, y \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{A}y, y \rangle} y$ .
3:  $r = \mathcal{A}x - y$ .
4:  $p = x$ . #  $x_1, p_1, r_1$  are defined
5: for  $n = 2 \dots \text{MAXIT}$  do
6:   if  $n$  is even then
7:      $k := \frac{n}{2}$ 
8:      $s := (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} p$ 
9:      $t := (\mathcal{A} + \alpha_k I)^{-1} r$  # Implementation as in (40)
10:     $\zeta := -\frac{\langle \mathcal{A}r, s \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{A}p, s \rangle}$ 
11:     $p_{\text{old}} = p$  #  $p_{\text{old}} = p_{n-1}$ 
12:     $p := \zeta s + t$  #  $p = p_n$ 
13:  else
14:     $p = -\frac{\langle r, \mathcal{A}p \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{A}p, p \rangle} p - \frac{\langle r, \mathcal{A}p_{\text{old}} \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{A}p_{\text{old}}, p_{\text{old}} \rangle} p_{\text{old}} + r$ 
15:  end if
16:  if  $\mathcal{A}p = 0$  then
17:    Terminate algorithm # Failure by Breakdown
18:  else
19:     $\eta := \frac{\langle r, p \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{A}p, p \rangle}$ 
20:     $x = x - \eta p$  # Solution  $x_n$  at step  $n$ 
21:     $r = r - \eta \mathcal{A}p$  # Step  $n$  finished
22:  end if
23: end for

```

Next, we verify the orthogonality conditions (41) by induction. Assume that (41) holds with n replaced by $n - 1$.

In a Krylov step, $n = 2k + 1$. it follows by construction of the coefficients, cf. (36), that

$$\langle \mathcal{A}p_n, p_j \rangle = 0, \quad j = n - 1, n - 2.$$

For $j < n - 2$ we find by the induction hypothesis that, with some coefficients b_1, b_2 from (36),

$$\langle \mathcal{A}p_n, p_j \rangle = \langle b_1 p_{n-1} + b_2 p_{n-2} + r_{n-1}, \mathcal{A}p_j \rangle = \langle r_{n-1}, \mathcal{A}p_j \rangle.$$

However, $\mathcal{A}p_j \in \mathcal{KR}^{n-1}$, thus the right-hand side vanishes by induction hypothesis. Thus $\langle \mathcal{A}p_n, p_j \rangle \sim \delta_{n,j}$ is shown. The orthogonality of the residuals and p_j in (41) follows by $r_n = r_{n-1} - \eta \mathcal{A}p_n$ and by construction: Taking the inner product with p_n leads to $\langle r_n, p_n \rangle = 0$ by the definition of η , while $\langle r_n, p_j \rangle = 0$, for $j = 1, \dots, n - 1$, by the induction hypothesis and the just proven orthogonality. This settles the Krylov step case.

For a rational step $n = 2k$, it follows by construction, cf. (37), and the induction hypothesis for $n - 1$ that

$$\langle \mathcal{A}p_n, p_{n-1} \rangle = 0.$$

Consider the equation for p_n :

$$\mathcal{A}p_n + \alpha_k p_n = \rho_n p_{n-1} + r_{n-1}.$$

Taking the inner product with $\mathcal{A}p_j$, for any $1 \leq j \leq n-2$, leads to

$$\langle \mathcal{A}p_n, \mathcal{A}p_j \rangle + \alpha_k \langle p_n, \mathcal{A}p_j \rangle = 0. \quad (42)$$

Indeed, this follows since $\langle p_{n-1}, \mathcal{A}p_j \rangle = 0$ by induction hypothesis, and, since $\mathcal{A}p_j \subset \mathcal{KR}^{n-1}$ by Theorem 2 and (19), it follows that

$$\langle r_{n-1}, \mathcal{A}p_j \rangle = \langle r_{n-1}, \text{span}\{p_1, \dots, p_{n-1}\} \rangle = 0$$

again by the induction hypothesis. Thus, (42) holds.

Define the matrix/operator

$$P_{n-1} = [p_1 \cdots p_{n-1}],$$

which maps \mathbb{R}^{n-1} to \mathcal{KR}^{n-2} . It follows from (42) that for any coefficient vector $\vec{c} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$

$$\langle \mathcal{A}p_{n-1}, \mathcal{A}P_{n-2}\vec{c} \rangle + \alpha_k \langle \mathcal{A}p_n, P_{n-2}\vec{c} \rangle = 0. \quad (43)$$

By Theorem 2 and (19) again it follows that $\mathcal{A}P_{n-2}\vec{c} \in \mathcal{KR}^{n-1}$, thus there exists a vector $\vec{g} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, and $g_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}$ with

$$\mathcal{A}P_{n-2}\vec{c} = P_{n-2}\vec{g} + g_{n-1}p_{n-1} \quad (44)$$

since the p_i , $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, span \mathcal{KR}^{n-1} . Hence, inserting this in (43) and noting $\langle \mathcal{A}p_n, p_{n-1} \rangle = 0$ gives

$$\langle \mathcal{A}p_n, P_{n-2}\vec{g} + \alpha_k P_{n-2}\vec{c} \rangle = 0. \quad (45)$$

Taking the inner product with $\mathcal{A}P_{n-2}$, we get from (44)

$$P_{n-2}^T \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} P_{n-2} \vec{c} = P_{n-2}^T \mathcal{A} P_{n-2} \vec{g}, \quad (46)$$

where we again used the induction hypothesis $\langle \mathcal{A}p_j, p_{n-1} \rangle = 0$ and where P_{n-1}^T denotes the transposed operator. The matrix on the right-hand side is invertible (in fact it is diagonal by the induction hypothesis) and nonsingular since \mathcal{A} has no nullspace on \mathcal{KR}^{n-2} . Thus, we can invert to find

$$\vec{g} = (P_{n-2}^T \mathcal{A} P_{n-2})^{-1} P_{n-2}^T \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} P_{n-2} \vec{c},$$

and inserting this into (45) gives

$$\langle \mathcal{A}p_n, [P_{n-2}(P_{n-2}^T \mathcal{A} P_{n-2})^{-1} P_{n-2}^T \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} P_{n-2} \vec{c} + \alpha_k P_{n-2} \vec{c}] \rangle = 0. \quad (47)$$

Now for any $j \in \{1, \dots, n-2\}$ we find a vector $\vec{c} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ such that

$$[(P_{n-2}^T \mathcal{A} P_{n-2})^{-1} P_{n-2}^T \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} P_{n-2} + \alpha_k I] \vec{c} = e_j,$$

Indeed, this identity can be rewritten as

$$P_{n-2}^T \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} P_{n-2} + \alpha_k (P_{n-2}^T \mathcal{A} P_{n-2}) \vec{c} = (P_{n-2}^T \mathcal{A} P_{n-2}) e_j.$$

The matrix on the left-hand side is a sum of positive semidefinite and positive definite matrices, hence invertible, and such a vector \vec{c} exists. Inserting that into (47) yields

$$\langle \mathcal{A}p_n, P_{n-2} e_j \rangle = 0,$$

and thus $\langle \mathcal{A}p_n, p_j \rangle = 0$ by the definition of P_{n-2} . Hence the orthogonality for p_n is proven. The orthogonality for r_n in (41) follows by the induction hypothesis, the update formula for r_n , the definition of η and the just proven orthogonality relation for p_n . Together, (41) is proven.

The statement that x_n is a least-squares solution in \mathcal{KR}^n is now a simple consequence of the facts that $x_n \in \mathcal{KR}^n$, that p_i span \mathcal{KR}^n , and the orthogonality relations for the residual, which together implies $\langle r_n, \mathcal{KR}^n \rangle = 0$. The latter is just the least-squares optimality condition in \mathcal{KR}^n . We also note that in case of a breakdown the same conclusion is valid as well, except that the sequence of optimal x_n saturates at the breakdown-index. If we extend the definition of the solution sequence x_n in Algorithm 3 as the last one computed x before breakdown, this still yields the least-squares solution even in this case. \square

Remark 3. *Since the Lanczos iteration Algorithm 2 also computes a least-squares solution in \mathcal{KR}^n and since by our assumptions the x_n are uniquely defined, it follows that the sequences x_n from Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 are identical in exact arithmetic. (The corresponding p_n might differ, though.)*

5.1 Regularization and stopping rule

The derived Algorithms 2 and 3 and also the aggregation method above shares some conceptual similarities with the CGNE method as they are (generalized) Krylov-space methods. In particular, all are nonlinear methods in the data y . Note that the CGNE method without stopping rule is even discontinuous in y [3], and we expect the same to be true for the stated method (including the aggregation method). However, it has been shown by Nemirovskii [15, 14] that the CGNE method with the discrepancy principle is a regularization method in the classical sense [3, 8]. Thus, showing that the algorithms are regularization methods is most probably impossible without including a stopping criterion.

Therefore, by analogy, we include in the algorithms a discrepancy stopping rule and terminate the method for the first iteration index n , where

$$\|Ax_n - y\| \leq \tau\delta, \quad (48)$$

where δ is the known noise level and $\tau > 1$ is a tuning parameter, e.g., $\tau = 1.1$. This residual can be easily calculated after x_n is known, and the for-loop in the algorithms has to be terminated if the stopping criterion is satisfied. As mentioned above, a proof that this provides a regularization method is outside the scope of this work.

6 Numerical Results

We test the rational CG algorithm, Algorithm 3, the rational Lanczos method, Algorithm 2, the aggregation method, (5) (referred to as “rational methods”) and compare them with the classical conjugate gradient method for the normal equation CGNE as given, e.g., in [3]. As simple test cases we used ten problems from the well-known Hansen Regularization Toolbox [10]: baart(2000), blur(60), deriv2(1000), gravity(1000), heat(1000), phillips(1000), shaw(1000), spikes(1000), wing(1000), tomo(35) and their default exact solutions. In case of no noise we use the default data, in case of a nonzero noiselevel, we added




Figure 1: Logarithm of the error $\|x_n - x_{exact}\|$ and the residual $\|Ax_n - y\|$ versus the iteration number for the rational CG method (Alg. 3), the Lanczos method (Alg. 2), the aggregation method (5), and the conjugate gradient method for the normal equation (CGNE). The circles represent values for the aggregation method, plotted at the index $n = 2k$, where k is the dimension of the aggregation space (number of Tikhonov solutions). The noiselevel is 0.

standard normal distributed random noise to the data (by Matlab’s `randn` command). In the latter case, all algorithms were stopped using a discrepancy principle with $\tau = 1.01$. All problems have matrices with sizes of the order of $10^3 \times 10^3$. The “blur” and “tomo” examples have sparse matrices.

At first we test the performance for the noise-free case using the exact toolbox data. The sequence of regularization parameters α_i was for all problems set as exponentially decreasing:

$$\alpha_i = 10^{-i-1}. \quad (49)$$

In Figure 1, we display the least-squares residual $\|Ax_n - y\|$ and the error $\|x_n - x_{exact}\|$ for the “tomo” problem and for the three proposed methods and the CGNE method. In the figure, the circles correspond to the values of the aggregation method with the same α_i , i.e., the results for the aggregation method with a number of k Tikhonov regularizations x_{α_i} are plotted at $n = 2k$, which is the index, where the rational CG and the rational Lanczos method need the same number of Tikhonov solves as the aggregation method.

The general observation that seems to be true throughout is that the results for the rational CG method and the rational Lanczos method are in general identical (as predicted by the theory) as long as the α_i are not too small, but the method differ when we are in the realm of ill-conditioning (for α too small). Note that the theory assumes exact arithmetic, which is no longer true when rounding error play a significant role. However, the difference of the two methods usually occurs beyond a reasonable stopping rule. We also note that for all tested examples, the residual is smaller than that of the CGNE as long as we are not in the ill-conditioning region. In many cases, the error for rational CG/Lanczos method agree with the corresponding ones of the aggregation method in the “reasonable” region. Note that the decay of the residual for CGNE is much slower, but of course, one has to take into account that each iteration of the method is of different complexity.

In Table 1, we present the result of the error $\|x_n - x_{exact}\|$, the computation

Table 1: Error $\|x_n - x_{exact}\|$, computation time (Time (s)), and number of iterations for various problems from the Regularization Toolbox for the aggregation method (5), the Lanczos method (Alg. 2), the aggregation method, the rational CG method (Alg. 3), and the CGNE method. 5000 is n_{max} for CGNE. α_k chosen by (49).

Problem		Aggreg.	Lanczos	RationalCG	CGNE
baart	Error	5.85E-02	6.58E-02	6.06E-02	2.47E-02
	Time	2.57	0.33	0.86	0.47
	Iter.	1	6	15	125
blur	Error	3.13E-07	2.81E-12	2.88E-12	1.15E-13
	Time	4.84	2.49	2.32	0.11
	Iter.	1	13	13	575
deriv2	Error	7.41E-04	6.97E-04	9.17E-05	8.43E-03
	Time	0.71	0.50	0.27	1.24
	Iter.	1	77	34	5000
gravity	Error	7.50E-03	4.48E-03	5.33E-03	3.70E-05
	Time	0.29	0.11	0.15	1.13
	Iter.	1	18	18	5000
heat	Error	1.41E-02	1.18E-02	1.20E-02	1.40E-02
	Time	0.46	0.14	0.18	1.11
	Iter.	1	25	25	5000
phillips	Error	1.89E-04	4.61E-05	5.71E-05	2.40E-05
	Time	0.28	0.11	0.13	1.12
	Iter.	1	17	16	5000
shaw	Error	2.33E-01	2.31E-01	2.22E-01	2.86E-03
	Time	0.36	0.07	0.16	1.11
	Iter.	1	13	21	5000
spikes	Error	2.60E+01	2.60E+01	2.60E+01	2.59E+01
	Time	0.24	0.10	0.14	1.01
	Iter.	1	17	17	5000
wing	Error	1.90E-01	2.57E-01	1.90E-01	1.80E-01
	Time	0.32	0.04	0.06	0.03
	Iter.	1	5	7	83
tomo	Error	8.39E-01	8.39E-01	8.39E-01	1.18E+00
	Time	0.63	0.22	0.29	0.74
	Iter.	1	13	12	5000

time in seconds, and the number of iteration for the various methods and for the noise-free case. In order to find an appropriate n in this case we first run the problem each up to a given maximal number of iteration and then choose that index n where the error is the smallest (a kind of “oracle” stopping rule). The results are given in Table 1 together with the total running time (using Matlab’s tic/toc command). The value of 5000 for the CGNE method is the maximal number of used iteration.

We observe that the rational CG and the Lanczos method perform roughly the same and outperform the aggregation method both in terms of error and time. The CGNE method has a smaller error in 7 cases but requires less time in only 3 cases.

The next experiments concerns the case of nonzero noiselevel. The results for two noiselevels $\delta = 1\%, 0.1\%$ (using the discrepancy stopping rule) are given in Table 2. It can be seen that the Lanczos and rational CG method are about similar in behaviour. The running time of the CGNE method cannot be beaten by any of the rational methods. The rational method need about 10 times

Table 2: Error $\|x_n - x_{exact}\|$, computation time (Time (s)), and number of iterations for various problems from the Regularization Toolbox for the aggregation method (5), the Lanczos method (Alg. 2), the rational CG method (Alg. 3), and the CGNE method and for two noiselevels $\delta = 1\%$ and 0.1% . Stopping rule by the discrepancy principle with $\tau = 1.01$.

Problem			Aggreg.	Lanczos	Rat.CG	CG
baart	$\delta = 1\%$	Error	3.23E-01	3.20E-01	3.20E-01	2.09E-01
		Time	0.176	0.160	0.174	0.020
		Iter.	1	2	2	3
	$\delta = 0.1\%$	Error	2.06E-01	2.08E-01	2.08E-01	2.08E-01
		Time	0.353	0.165	0.181	0.020
		Iter.	1	3	3	3
blur	$\delta = 1\%$	Error	2.39E+00	4.63E+00	4.63E+00	5.23E+00
		Time	0.733	0.327	0.342	0.004
		Iter.	1	2	2	9
	$\delta = 0.1\%$	Error	1.16E+00	1.09E+00	1.09E+00	1.36E+00
		Time	0.745	0.713	0.785	0.010
		Iter.	1	4	4	36
deriv2	$\delta = 1\%$	Error	1.66E-01	1.88E-01	1.88E-01	1.88E-01
		Time	0.115	0.036	0.037	0.005
		Iter.	1	4	4	4
	$\delta = 0.1\%$	Error	1.22E-01	1.20E-01	1.20E-01	1.22E-01
		Time	0.187	0.070	0.076	0.007
		Iter.	1	8	8	9
gravity	$\delta = 1\%$	Error	7.19E-01	7.18E-01	7.18E-01	1.75E+00
		Time	0.037	0.030	0.031	0.003
		Iter.	1	2	2	4
	$\delta = 0.1\%$	Error	5.23E-01	5.22E-01	5.22E-01	8.06E-01
		Time	0.040	0.027	0.026	0.003
		Iter.	1	2	2	6
heat	$\delta = 1\%$	Error	1.11E+00	9.92E-01	9.92E-01	1.30E+00
		Time	0.075	0.059	0.056	0.005
		Iter.	1	6	6	9
	$\delta = 0.1\%$	Error	4.16E-01	4.02E-01	4.02E-01	5.02E-01
		Time	0.150	0.068	0.074	0.008
		Iter.	1	8	8	18
phillips	$\delta = 1\%$	Error	3.96E-02	3.94E-02	3.94E-02	7.98E-02
		Time	0.028	0.024	0.024	0.002
		Iter.	1	2	2	4
	$\delta = 0.1\%$	Error	3.77E-02	3.76E-02	3.76E-02	7.30E-02
		Time	0.027	0.025	0.024	0.002
		Iter.	1	2	2	4
shaw	$\delta = 1\%$	Error	4.16E+00	4.15E+00	4.15E+00	5.25E+00
		Time	0.038	0.024	0.024	0.002
		Iter.	1	2	2	4
	$\delta = 0.1\%$	Error	1.63E+00	1.89E+00	1.89E+00	1.67E+00
		Time	0.110	0.038	0.041	0.003
		Iter.	1	5	5	6
spikes	$\delta = 1\%$	Error	2.68E+01	2.68E+01	2.68E+01	2.67E+01
		Time	0.039	0.025	0.024	0.003
		Iter.	1	2	2	7
	$\delta = 0.1\%$	Error	2.62E+01	2.62E+01	2.62E+01	2.63E+01
		Time	0.047	0.025	0.025	0.004
		Iter.	1	2	2	13
wing	$\delta = 1\%$	Error	3.48E-01	3.48E-01	3.48E-01	3.48E-01
		Time	0.062	0.028	0.027	0.002
		Iter.	1	2	2	2
	$\delta = 0.1\%$	Error	3.48E-01	3.48E-01	3.48E-01	3.48E-01
		Time	0.056	0.024	0.024	0.001
		Iter.	1	2	2	2
tomo	$\delta = 1\%$	Error	6.31E+00	6.31E+00	6.31E+00	8.78E+00
		Time	0.105	0.078	0.083	0.006
		Iter.	1	2	2	16
	$\delta = 0.1\%$	Error	3.10E+00	3.10E+00	3.10E+00	5.03E+00
		Time	0.105	0.075	0.091	0.018
		Iter.	1	2	2	76




Figure 2: Convergence rates for the the aggregation method (5), the Lanczos method (Alg. 2), the rational CG method (Alg. 3), and the CGNE method for the “deriv2” (left) and the “tomo” (right) problems (overlaid plots). Displayed is the error $\|x_n - x_{exact}\|$ vs. the noiselevel in a log-log plot for two smoothness cases for each problem. (The steeper slopes correspond to the case of a smoother solution.) The error for CGNE is plotted by a thicker line as reference.

more running time than CGNE. However, compared to CGNE, we observe that in a majority of cases the proposed methods outperform the CGNE method in terms of the error. One reason for this is that the CGNE does not allow for fine-tuning of the regularization parameter (which is the iteration index in this case). An optimal stopping index for CGNE would be “in between” two iterations, whatever that should mean.

The next figures concern the convergence rates of the discussed rational methods, i.e., aggregation, rational Lanczos, and the rational CG method, which are compared with the rates of the classical CGNE method. In Figure 2 we display the error $\|x_n - x^\dagger\|$ against various noiselevel δ on a log-log plot for all methods for four cases: First for the problem “deriv2” with the default true solution x_{exact} and then again with a smoother solution, which is simply calculated by $x_{smooth} = A^* A x_{exact}$. This automatically implies a higher convergence rates for the later case because a higher source condition is satisfied. We do the same for the problem “tomo”, i.e., default solution and smooth solution. The noise is generated again by samples from a standard normal random distribution.

The results for the two test cases for “deriv2” are displayed together on the left plot and that for “tomo” on the right. (The steeper slope corresponds to smoother solution). The reason for using smoother solution is to investigate whether the methods show a saturation in the convergence rates, which is known to happen for Tikhonov regularization. For the “deriv2” problem, all methods perform equally well, for the tomo problem this is true except for the CG method for the smooth solution, which has a slightly smaller slope (and thus a worse convergence rate). This figures should illustrate that all proposed methods show a similar (or even slightly better) rate than CGNE, which is known to achieve the theoretically optimal-order rates. We observe that no saturation seems to happen, and we conjecture from the results that the rational methods are optimal-order method for all classical smoothness classes [3].

Finally, we tested the performance of the methods with respect to the choice

of the sequence of regularization parameters. That is, we choose a geometrically decaying sequence of the form $\alpha_k = 0.1q^{s-k}$, for various $q \in 2, 4, 6, 8, 10$ and various starting values $s = -12, -10, \dots, 8, 10$. Thus, in the extreme cases, we start with a very large α or a very small one, and the q controls the speed of the decay. We tested this for the “tomo” problem with 0.01% noise. Without details, we made the following observations:

- For most cases, the results were good, the speed of decay (choice of q) did not have much of an influence.
- The number of iterations is high (and the methods are slow) if we start with a very large α , i.e., far away from a reasonable good regularization parameter.
- Starting with a too-small α (much below an “optimal” value) yields comparably bad results (large error). In this case, the aggregation, the rational CG, and the Lanczos method become unstable. However, such a failure only happened for the extreme case $\alpha_k = 10^{-12-k}$.
- Starting with a too-large regularization parameter α leads to stability problems with the Lanczos method, for instance, when $\alpha_k = 10^{10-k}$. This can be explained by the fact that in such a case the Tikhonov inverse $(A^*A + \alpha I)^{-1}A^*y \sim \frac{1}{\alpha}A^*y + O(\frac{1}{\alpha^2})$, is almost a scaled multiple of the first element in the Krylov space, and thus the mixed Krylov space is close to breakdown. The rational CG method behaved more robust in that respect.
- As to be expected, if we start with an α that is already a good choice for classical Tikhonov regularization, then the methods terminate after 2 iteration (i.e., after the first rational step) with good results.

Further comments

In terms of error we have verified an excellent performance of the rational methods, often even better than the CGNE method. The downside is, however, the additional computation time required. This, however, should not lead to an a-priori refusal of these new methods. As soon as one admit Tikhonov regularization with a parameter choice search as useful methods, then the rational CG methods should be considered equally admissible, since it requires the same effort, has always a smaller residual, and, what is important, shows little sensitivity to the actually choice of regularization parameter, as long as we treat it as iterative method coupled with a stopping rule.

There is plenty of room for generalizing the methods and further investigations. We did not focus on tuning the rational methods; for instance, one can ease the Tikhonov inversions by invoking an a-priori factorization of the system matrix (for which even the rational Lanczos method could be used). A stimulating piece of research would be to investigate the effect of an incomplete computation of the Tikhonov solutions. A extension of the method to the nonlinear case is highly interesting, but the modality is not obvious.

7 Conclusion

We derived the rational Lanczos and rational CG method for iteratively minimizing linear least-squares problems over mixed rational Krylov spaces. We illustrate that these methods and the associated aggregation method perform equally well or better than the conjugate gradient method for the normal equations in terms of the error. In terms of runtime, the CGNE method cannot be beaten but we did not attempt to improve this by further tuning. The main novelty is the rational CG method that requires only short recursions, with Tikhonov regularization in each second step, and nearly no additional memory requirements.

References

- [1] D. G. ANDERSON, *Iterative procedures for nonlinear integral equations*, J. Assoc. Comput. Mach., 12 (1965), pp. 547–560.
- [2] J. CHEN, S. PEREVERZYEV, JR., AND Y. XU, *Aggregation of regularized solutions from multiple observation models*, Inverse Problems, 31 (2015), pp. 075005, 23.
- [3] H. W. ENGL, M. HANKE, AND A. NEUBAUER, *Regularization of inverse problems*, vol. 375 of Mathematics and its Applications, Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1996.
- [4] S. GAZZOLA, P. C. HANSEN, AND J. G. NAGY, *IR Tools: a MATLAB package of iterative regularization methods and large-scale test problems*, Numer. Algorithms, 81 (2019), pp. 773–811.
- [5] E. R. GIZEWSKI, L. MAYER, B. A. MOSER, D. H. NGUYEN, S. PEREVERZYEV, JR., S. V. PEREVERZYEV, N. SHEPELEVA, AND W. ZELLINGER, *On a regularization of unsupervised domain adaptation in RKHS*, Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal., 57 (2022), pp. 201–227.
- [6] V. GRIMM, *A conjugate-gradient-type rational Krylov subspace method for ill-posed problems*, Inverse Problems, 36 (2020), pp. 015008, 19.
- [7] S. GÜTTEL, *Rational Krylov approximation of matrix functions: numerical methods and optimal pole selection*, GAMM-Mitt., 36 (2013), pp. 8–31.
- [8] M. HANKE, *Conjugate gradient type methods for ill-posed problems*, vol. 327 of Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow, 1995.
- [9] M. HANKE AND C. W. GROETSCH, *Nonstationary iterated Tikhonov regularization*, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 98 (1998), pp. 37–53.
- [10] P. C. HANSEN, *Regularization tools: a Matlab package for analysis and solution of discrete ill-posed problems*, Numer. Algorithms, 6 (1994), pp. 1–35.
- [11] M. R. HESTENES AND E. STIEFEL, *Methods of conjugate gradients for solving linear systems*, J. Research Nat. Bur. Standards, 49 (1952), pp. 409–436 (1953).

- [12] S. KINDERMANN, S. PEREVERZYEV, JR., AND A. PILIPENKO, *The quasi-optimality criterion in the linear functional strategy*, Inverse Problems, 34 (2018), pp. 075001, 24.
- [13] G. L. MYLEIKO, S. PEREVERZYEV, JR., AND S. G. SOLODKY, *Regularized Nyström subsampling in regression and ranking problems under general smoothness assumptions*, Anal. Appl. (Singap.), 17 (2019), pp. 453–475.
- [14] A. NEMIROVSKII, *The regularizing properties of the adjoint gradient method in ill-posed problems*, USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, 26 (1986), pp. 7–16.
- [15] A. S. NEMIROVSKIĬ, *Regularizing properties of the conjugate gradient method in ill-posed problems*, Zh. Vychisl. Mat. i Mat. Fiz., 26 (1986), pp. 332–347, 477.
- [16] S. PEREVERZYEV, *An introduction to artificial intelligence based on reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces*, Compact Textbooks in Mathematics, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, [2022] ©2022.
- [17] M. S. PRANIĆ AND L. REICHEL, *Recurrence relations for orthogonal rational functions*, Numer. Math., 123 (2013), pp. 629–642.
- [18] M. S. PRANIĆ, L. REICHEL, G. RODRIGUEZ, Z. WANG, AND X. YU, *A rational Arnoldi process with applications*, Numer. Linear Algebra Appl., 23 (2016), pp. 1007–1022.
- [19] A. RUHE, *Rational Krylov sequence methods for eigenvalue computation*, Linear Algebra Appl., 58 (1984), pp. 391–405.
- [20] Y. SAAD, *Iterative methods for sparse linear systems*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, second ed., 2003.
- [21] P. TKACHENKO, *Regularization by aggregation of global and local data on the sphere*, Comput. Methods Appl. Math., 16 (2016), pp. 299–307.