

ON GREEDY MULTI-STEP INERTIAL RANDOMIZED KACZMARZ METHOD FOR SOLVING LINEAR SYSTEMS

YANSHENG SU, DEREN HAN, YUN ZENG, AND JIAXIN XIE

ABSTRACT. Recently, the multi-step inertial randomized Kaczmarz (MIRK) method for solving large-scale linear systems was proposed in [17]. In this paper, we incorporate the greedy probability criterion into the MIRK method, along with the introduction of a tighter threshold parameter for this criterion. We prove that the proposed greedy MIRK (GMIRK) method enjoys an improved deterministic linear convergence compared to both the MIRK method and the greedy randomized Kaczmarz method. Furthermore, we exhibit that the multi-step inertial extrapolation approach can be seen geometrically as an orthogonal projection method, and establish its relationship with the sketch-and-project method [15] and the oblique projection technique [22]. Numerical experiments are provided to confirm our results.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the following system of linear equations

$$(1) \quad Ax = b,$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. The problem for solving the linear system (1) comes up in many fields of scientific computing and engineering, including computerized tomography [16], signal processing [6], optimal control [26], and machine learning [7]. Throughout this paper, we assume that the linear system (1) is consistent, i.e. there exists a x^* such that $Ax^* = b$.

The Kaczmarz method [19], also known as *algebraic reconstruction technique* (ART) [12, 18], is a classic and effective row-action method for solving the linear system (1). For any $i \in [m] := \{1, \dots, m\}$, let a_i denote the transpose of the i -th row of A and b_i denote the i -th entry of b . Starting from an initial point $x^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the original Kaczmarz method constructs the next iterate $x^{(k+1)}$ using the following update rule:

$$(2) \quad x^{(k+1)} = x^{(k)} - \frac{a_{i_k}^\top x^{(k)} - b_{i_k}}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2} a_{i_k},$$

where the index $i_k = (k \bmod m) + 1$. In some cases, the Kaczmarz method may converge slowly when the rows of the coefficient matrix are in an unfavorable order. This can happen, for example, when there are two adjacent rows that are very close to each other. To address

Key words: Kaczmarz method, greedy probability criterion, inertial extrapolation, deterministic linear convergence, sketch-and-project, oblique projection

Mathematics subject classification (2020): 65F10, 65F20, 90C25, 15A06, 68W20

this issue, one approach is to select a working row from the matrix A randomly rather than sequentially [11, 18, 23, 30]. The celebrated result of Strohmer and Vershynin [28] shows that if the index i_k is selected randomly with probability proportional to $\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2$, the resulting *randomized Kaczmarz* (RK) method converges linearly in expectation. This result has sparked significant interest in RK-type methods due to their computational efficiency and scalability. Recently, Li et al [22] have introduced and analyzed the Kaczmarz method with oblique projection, where the next iteration is chosen to be on the intersection of two hyperplanes. Theoretical analysis demonstrated that the convergence rate of the RK method with oblique projection is much faster than the RK method.

It is well known that using a better probability criterion can result in a more favorable order of working rows, thereby accelerating the convergence of the RK method. To enhance the convergence property of the RK method, Bai and Wu [2] first introduced the *greedy probability criterion* and developed the *greedy randomized Kaczmarz* (GRK) method for solving the linear system (1). By employing this greedy probability criterion, small entries of the residual vector $Ax^{(k)} - b$ will not be selected, ensuring progress in each iteration of GRK. This property also leads to a faster convergence rate of GRK compared to RK. In recent years, there has been a large amount of work on the refinements and extensions of the GRK method, such as the capped adaptive sampling rule [13, 33], the greedy augmented randomized Kaczmarz method for inconsistent linear systems [4], the greedy randomized coordinate descent method [3], the momentum variant of the GRK method [29], and the capped nonlinear Kaczmarz method [35]. In addition, we note that there has also been some work on non-random Kaczmarz methods [8, 25, 34] inspired by the GRK method. We refer to [1] and [5] for recent surveys on the Kaczmarz method.

The inertial extrapolation, initially introduced by Polyak [27], has been widely used to improve the performance of iterative algorithms. The main feature of inertial type methods is that the next iteration is determined by utilizing the previous two iterates. Recently, the inertial extrapolation approach has been introduced to accelerate the RK method [17], where two types of inertial RK method, known as the alternated inertial RK (AIRK) method and the multi-step inertial RK (MIRK) method have been developed. The authors showed that the MIRK method is superior to the AIRK method in both theoretical analysis and practical applications. However, the geometric explanation of MIRK is rather vague while the AIRK method has a connection with the two-subspace Kaczmarz method [24, 32].

In this paper, we incorporate the greedy probability criterion into the MIRK method and propose the greedy MIRK (GMIRK) method for solving linear systems. Particularly, we propose a tighter threshold parameter for the greedy probability criterion. Theoretical analysis shows that the GMIRK method achieves a better convergence rate compared to both the MIRK method and the GRK method. Furthermore, our convergence result about the linear convergence of the GMIRK method is based on the quantity $\|x^{(k)} - x^*\|_2^2$, rather than its expectation $\mathbb{E}[\|x^{(k)} - x^*\|_2^2]$, which is commonly used in the literature [2, 4]. We refer such convergence as *deterministic*. Numerical results demonstrate that the GMIRK method outperforms the GRK method in terms of both iteration counts and computing times, especially when the rows are highly coherent.

In addition, we give an elaborate geometric explanation for the multi-step inertial extrapolation approach. Recall that the Kaczmarz method orthogonally projects the iterate $x^{(k)}$ onto the solution set $\{x \mid \langle a_{i_k}, x \rangle = b_{i_k}\}$ at each iteration. In this paper, we exhibit that the Kaczmarz method with multi-step inertial extrapolation approach actually projects $x^{(k)}$ onto the solution set of two successive working rows

$$\left\{ x \mid \begin{bmatrix} a_{i_{k-1}} \\ a_{i_k} \end{bmatrix} x = \begin{bmatrix} b_{i_{k-1}} \\ b_{i_k} \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$

This geometric explanation provides further insight into why the multi-step inertial extrapolation approach is faster. We further establish the connection between our algorithm and the sketch-and-project method [14, 15], which is a general framework of randomized iterative methods for linear systems. We also exhibit that the randomized Kaczmarz method with oblique projection [22] can also be interpreted properly in such geometric views.

1.1. Notations and preliminaries. We here give some notations that will be used in the paper. For vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we use x_i, x^\top and $\|x\|_2$ to denote the i -th entry, the transpose and the Euclidean norm of x , respectively. For matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, we use $a_i, A^\top, A^\dagger, \|A\|_F, \text{Range}(A), \text{Rank}(A), \sigma_{\max}(A)$, and $\sigma_{\min}(A)$ to denote the i -th row, the transpose, the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse, the Frobenius norm, the range space, the rank, the largest and the smallest non-zero singular value of A , respectively. For any $i \in [m]$, let P_i denote the orthogonal projection operator onto the hyperplane $H_i = \{x \mid \langle a_i, x \rangle = b_i\}$, i.e. for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$P_i(x) = x - \frac{\langle a_i, x \rangle - b_i}{\|a_i\|_2^2} a_i.$$

We define

$$(3) \quad \gamma_1 := \max_{i \in [m]} \sum_{\substack{j=1, \\ j \neq i}}^m \|a_j\|_2^2, \quad \gamma_2 := \max_{\substack{i, j \in [m] \\ i \neq j}} \sum_{\substack{k=1, \\ k \neq i, j}}^m \|a_k\|_2^2,$$

and

$$(4) \quad \delta := \min_{i, j \in [m], i \neq j} \left| \left\langle \frac{a_i}{\|a_i\|_2}, \frac{a_j}{\|a_j\|_2} \right\rangle \right|.$$

In fact, δ can be used to measure the coherence [10] between the rows of the matrix A . Throughout this paper, we assume that for any $i, j \in [m]$ and $i \neq j$, a_i and a_j are linearly independent. Hence, it is obvious that $\gamma_2 < \gamma_1 < \|A\|_F^2$ and $0 \leq \delta < 1$.

1.2. Organization. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the GMIRK, analyze its convergence and present its geometric explanation. In Section 3, we perform some numerical experiments to show the effectiveness of the proposed method. Finally, we conclude this paper in Section 4.

2. THE GREEDY MULTI-STEP INERTIAL RANDOMIZED KACZMARZ METHOD

In this section, we present the *greedy multi-step inertial randomized Kaczmarz* (GMIRK) method for solving the linear system (1). The algorithm is formally described in Algorithm 1, where the parameter sequence $\{\beta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is carefully designed (see Remark 2.4).

Algorithm 1 Greedy multi-step inertial randomized Kaczmarz (GMIRK) method

Input: $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\theta \in [0, 1]$, $k = 0$ and initial points $x^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

1: Compute

$$(5) \quad \varepsilon_k = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\|Ax^{(k)} - b\|_2^2} \max_{i \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{|a_i^\top x^{(k)} - b_i|^2}{\|a_i\|_2^2} \right\} + \frac{1}{\Gamma_k} \right).$$

Here $\Gamma_0 = \|A\|_F^2$, $\Gamma_1 = \gamma_1$ and for $k \geq 2$, $\Gamma_k = \gamma_2$, where γ_1 and γ_2 are defined as (3).

2: Determine the index set

$$(6) \quad \mathcal{I}_k = \left\{ i \mid |a_i^\top x^{(k)} - b_i|^2 \geq \varepsilon_k \|Ax^{(k)} - b\|_2^2 \|a_i\|_2^2 \right\}.$$

3: Select $i_k \in \mathcal{I}_k$ according to some probability

$$\text{Prob}(i_k = i) = p_i^{(k)},$$

where $p_i^{(k)} = 0$ if $i \notin \mathcal{I}_k$, $p_i^{(k)} \geq 0$ if $i \in \mathcal{I}_k$, and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} p_i^{(k)} = 1$.

4: Compute

$$\beta_k = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } k = 0; \\ \frac{\langle a_{i_k}, a_{i_{k-1}} \rangle (\langle a_{i_k}, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_k})}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2 \|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2 - \langle a_{i_k}, a_{i_{k-1}} \rangle^2}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

5: Set

$$(7) \quad w^{(k)} = \begin{cases} x^{(k)}, & \text{if } k = 0; \\ x^{(k)} + \beta_k a_{i_{k-1}}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

6: Set

$$x^{(k+1)} = w^{(k)} - \frac{\langle a_{i_k}, w^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_k}}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2} a_{i_k}.$$

7: If the stopping rule is satisfied, stop and go to output. Otherwise, set $k = k + 1$ and return to Step 1.

Output: The approximate solution $x^{(k)}$.

It can be observed that when $k = 0$, Algorithm 1 and the GRK method utilize the same iteration. For $k \geq 1$, since $\langle a_{i_k}, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_k} \neq 0$ (otherwise, $Ax^{(k)} - b = 0$ which indicates that the GMIRK method has converged), it can be verified that $x^{(k)} \neq w^{(k-1)}$. Consequently,

$$x^{(k+1)} = P_{i_k}(x^{(k)} + \beta'_k(x^{(k)} - w^{(k-1)})),$$

where

$$\beta'_k = -\frac{(\langle a_{i_k}, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_k}) \langle a_{i_{k-1}}, a_{i_k} \rangle \|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2}{(\langle a_{i_{k-1}}, w^{(k-1)} \rangle - b_{i_{k-1}}) (\|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2 \|a_{i_k}\|_2^2 - \langle a_{i_{k-1}}, a_{i_k} \rangle^2)},$$

which means that the construction of $x^{(k+1)}$ involves $x^{(0)}, x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(k)}$, hence Algorithm 1 is a multi-step inertial algorithm [9]. We refer the reader to [17, Remark 4.1] for more details.

Comparing to the original greedy probability criterion [2], there are mainly two modifications in the row selection rule of our method. After determining \mathcal{I}_k , the original criterion requires computes

$$(8) \quad \tilde{r}_i^{(k)} = \begin{cases} a_i^\top x^{(k)} - b_i, & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{I}_k, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and selects i_k with probability $\text{Prob}(i_k = i) = \frac{|\tilde{r}_i^{(k)}|^2}{\|\tilde{r}^{(k)}\|_2^2}$. In our method, it is generalized into any valid probability $\text{Prob}(i_k = i) = p_i^{(k)}$, as long as $p_i^{(k)} = 0$ when $i \notin \mathcal{I}_k$.

Another modification arises in the threshold parameter ε_k . Compared to the ε_k employed in [2], i.e.

$$\varepsilon_k = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\|Ax^{(k)} - b\|_2^2} \max_{i \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{|a_i^\top x^{(k)} - b_i|^2}{\|a_i\|_2^2} \right\} + \frac{1}{\|A\|_F^2} \right),$$

the last summand in (5) is changed into $\frac{1}{\Gamma_k}$. This modification would help to provide a tighter threshold parameter ε_k , as $\frac{1}{\Gamma_k} > \frac{1}{\|A\|_F^2}$ for $k \geq 1$.

Next, we show that the GMIRK method is well defined as index set \mathcal{I}_k defined in (6) is nonempty for $k \geq 0$. Let us first establish two useful lemmas. The first one describes that the residuals of $x^{(k)}$ on $a_{i_{k-1}}$ and $a_{i_{k-2}}$ are zero (when $k \geq 2$).

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose $\{x^{(k)}\}_{k \geq 0}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Then for any $k \geq 1$,*

$$(9) \quad r_{i_{k-1}}^{(k)} = \langle a_{i_{k-1}}, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_{k-1}} = 0,$$

and for any $k \geq 2$,

$$(10) \quad r_{i_{k-2}}^{(k)} = \langle a_{i_{k-2}}, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_{k-2}} = 0.$$

Proof. For $k \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_{i_{k-1}}^{(k)} &= \langle a_{i_{k-1}}, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_{k-1}} = \left\langle a_{i_{k-1}}, \left(w^{(k-1)} - \frac{\langle a_{i_{k-1}}, w^{(k-1)} \rangle - b_{i_{k-1}}}{\|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2} a_{i_{k-1}} \right) \right\rangle - b_{i_{k-1}} \\ &= \langle a_{i_{k-1}}, w^{(k-1)} \rangle - b_{i_{k-1}} - (\langle a_{i_{k-1}}, w^{(k-1)} \rangle - b_{i_{k-1}}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

For $k \geq 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_{i_{k-2}}^{(k)} &= \langle a_{i_{k-2}}, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_{k-2}} \\ &= \left\langle a_{i_{k-2}}, \left(w^{(k-1)} - \frac{\langle a_{i_{k-1}}, w^{(k-1)} \rangle - b_{i_{k-1}}}{\|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2} a_{i_{k-1}} \right) \right\rangle - b_{i_{k-2}} \\ &= \left\langle a_{i_{k-2}}, \left((x^{(k-1)} + \beta_{k-1} a_{i_{k-2}}) - \frac{\langle a_{i_{k-1}}, (x^{(k-1)} + \beta_{k-1} a_{i_{k-2}}) \rangle - b_{i_{k-1}}}{\|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2} a_{i_{k-1}} \right) \right\rangle - b_{i_{k-2}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \langle a_{i_{k-2}}, x^{(k-1)} \rangle - b_{i_{k-2}} + \beta_{k-1} \frac{\|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2 \|a_{i_{k-2}}\|_2^2 - \langle a_{i_{k-1}}, a_{i_{k-2}} \rangle^2}{\|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2} \\
&\quad - \frac{\langle a_{i_{k-1}}, a_{i_{k-2}} \rangle (\langle a_{i_{k-1}}, x^{(k-1)} \rangle - b_{i_{k-1}})}{\|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2} \\
&= \langle a_{i_{k-2}}, x^{(k-1)} \rangle - b_{i_{k-2}} = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from (9). \square

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose that $\Gamma_0 = \|A\|_F^2$, $\Gamma_1 = \gamma_1$ and for $k \geq 2$, $\Gamma_k = \gamma_2$, where γ_1 and γ_2 are defined as (3). Let $\{x^{(k)}\}_{k \geq 0}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Then for any $k \geq 0$,*

$$\max_{i \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{|\langle a_i, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_i|^2}{\|a_i\|_2^2} \right\} \geq \frac{1}{\Gamma_k} \|Ax^{(k)} - b\|_2^2.$$

Proof. When $k = 0$,

$$\max_{i \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{|\langle a_i, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_i|^2}{\|a_i\|_2^2} \right\} \geq \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\|a_i\|_2^2}{\|A\|_F^2} \frac{|\langle a_i, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_i|^2}{\|a_i\|_2^2} = \frac{1}{\|A\|_F^2} \|Ax^{(k)} - b\|_2^2.$$

This is because the largest term in $\left\{ \frac{|\langle a_i, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_i|^2}{\|a_i\|_2^2} \right\}_{i=1}^m$ is not less than any convex combination of all the terms. Similarly, when $k = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{i \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{|\langle a_i, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_i|^2}{\|a_i\|_2^2} \right\} &\geq \sum_{\substack{i=1, \\ i \neq i_{k-1}}}^m \frac{\|a_i\|_2^2}{\|A\|_F^2 - \|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2} \frac{|\langle a_i, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_i|^2}{\|a_i\|_2^2} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\gamma_1} \sum_{\substack{i=1, \\ i \neq i_{k-1}}}^m |\langle a_i, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_i|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{\gamma_1} \sum_{i=1}^m |\langle a_i, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_i|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{\gamma_1} \|Ax^{(k)} - b\|_2^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from (9). When $k \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{i \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{|\langle a_i, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_i|^2}{\|a_i\|_2^2} \right\} &\geq \sum_{\substack{i=1, \\ i \neq i_{k-1}, i_{k-2}}}^m \frac{\|a_i\|_2^2}{\|A\|_F^2 - \|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2 - \|a_{i_{k-2}}\|_2^2} \frac{|\langle a_i, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_i|^2}{\|a_i\|_2^2} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\gamma_2} \sum_{\substack{i=1, \\ i \neq i_{k-1}, i_{k-2}}}^m |\langle a_i, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_i|^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{\gamma_2} \sum_{i=1}^m |\langle a_i, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_i|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{\gamma_2} \|Ax^{(k)} - b\|_2^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from (9) and (10). \square

By the definition of \mathcal{I}_k in (6), we know that $i \in \mathcal{I}_k$ if and only if

$$\frac{|\langle a_i, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_i|}{\|a_i\|_2^2} \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\max_{i \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{|\langle a_i, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_i|^2}{\|a_i\|_2^2} \right\} + \frac{1}{\Gamma_k} \|Ax^{(k)} - b\|_2^2 \right).$$

Lemma 2.2 shows that at least $i_k^M \in \arg \max_{i \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{|\langle a_i, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_i|^2}{\|a_i\|_2^2} \right\}$ belongs to \mathcal{I}_k . Thus \mathcal{I}_k is nonempty and the GMIRK method is well defined.

2.1. Convergence analysis. We have the following convergence result for Algorithm 1.

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose that $x^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $x^* = A^\dagger b + (I - A^\dagger A)x^{(0)}$ denote the projection of $x^{(0)}$ onto the solution set of $Ax = b$. Then the iteration sequence $\{x^{(k)}\}_{k \geq 0}$ generated by Algorithm 1 satisfies*

$$\|x^{(1)} - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \rho_0 \|x^{(0)} - x^*\|_2^2$$

and

$$\|x^{(k)} - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \rho_2^{k-2} \rho_1 \rho_0 \|x^{(0)} - x^*\|_2^2, \quad k = 2, 3, \dots,$$

where

$$\rho_0 = \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_{\min}^2(A)}{\|A\|_F^2} \right), \quad \rho_1 = \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_{\min}^2(A)}{(1 - \delta^2)\gamma_1} \right), \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_2 = \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_{\min}^2(A)}{(1 - \delta^2)\gamma_2} \right),$$

and γ_1, γ_2 , and δ are defined as (3) and (4), respectively.

Proof. By the iterative strategy of Algorithm 1, for $k \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x^{(k+1)} - x^*\|_2^2 &= \left\| w^{(k)} - x^* - \frac{\langle a_{i_k}, w^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_k}}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2} a_{i_k} \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \|w^{(k)} - x^*\|_2^2 - \frac{|\langle a_{i_k}, w^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_k}|^2}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2} \\
&= \|x^{(k)} - x^* + \beta_k a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2 - \frac{|\langle a_{i_k}, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_k} + \beta_k \langle a_{i_k}, a_{i_{k-1}} \rangle|^2}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2} \\
&\stackrel{\textcircled{a}}{=} \|x^{(k)} - x^*\|_2^2 + \beta_k^2 \|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2 - \frac{|\langle a_{i_k}, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_k}|^2}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2} - \beta_k^2 \frac{\langle a_{i_k}, a_{i_{k-1}} \rangle^2}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2} \\
&\quad - 2\beta_k \frac{\langle a_{i_k}, a_{i_{k-1}} \rangle (\langle a_{i_k}, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_k})}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2} \\
(11) \quad &= \|x^{(k)} - x^*\|_2^2 - \frac{|\langle a_{i_k}, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_k}|^2}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2}
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \beta_k^2 \frac{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2 \|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2 - \langle a_{i_k}, a_{i_{k-1}} \rangle^2}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2} - 2\beta_k \frac{\langle a_{i_k}, a_{i_{k-1}} \rangle (\langle a_{i_k}, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_k})}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2},$$

where ① follows from the fact that $\langle a_{i_{k-1}}, x^{(k)} - x^* \rangle = \langle a_{i_{k-1}}, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_{k-1}} = r_{i_{k-1}}^{(k)} = 0$. Then by the choices of β_k , for $k \geq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{(k+1)} - x^*\|_2^2 &= \|x^{(k)} - x^*\|_2^2 - \frac{|\langle a_{i_k}, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_k}|^2}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{\langle a_{i_k}, a_{i_{k-1}} \rangle^2}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2 \|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2 - \langle a_{i_k}, a_{i_{k-1}} \rangle^2} \frac{|\langle a_{i_k}, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_k}|^2}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2} \\ &= \|x^{(k)} - x^*\|_2^2 - \frac{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2 \|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2 \|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2 - \langle a_{i_k}, a_{i_{k-1}} \rangle^2} \frac{|\langle a_{i_k}, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_k}|^2}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2} \\ &= \|x^{(k)} - x^*\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{1 - \left\langle \frac{a_{i_k}}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2}, \frac{a_{i_{k-1}}}{\|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2} \right\rangle^2} \frac{|\langle a_{i_k}, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_k}|^2}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2} \\ &\stackrel{\text{①}}{\leq} \|x^{(k)} - x^*\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{1 - \delta^2} \frac{|\langle a_{i_k}, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_k}|^2}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2} \\ &\stackrel{\text{②}}{\leq} \|x^{(k)} - x^*\|_2^2 - \frac{\varepsilon_k}{1 - \delta^2} \|Ax^{(k)} - b\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where ① follows from the definition of the δ and ② follows from (6). For the case $k = 0$, by using the similar argument we can get

$$\|x^{(1)} - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \|x^{(0)} - x^*\|_2^2 - \varepsilon_0 \|Ax^{(0)} - b\|_2^2. \tag{13}$$

Next, let us give an estimate for the quantity ε_k . In fact, we have

$$\varepsilon_k = \frac{1}{2\|Ax^{(k)} - b\|_2^2} \max_{i \in [m]} \left\{ \frac{|\langle a_i, x^{(k)} \rangle - b_i|^2}{\|a_i\|_2^2} \right\} + \frac{1}{2\Gamma_k} \geq \frac{1}{2\Gamma_k} + \frac{1}{2\Gamma_k} = \frac{1}{\Gamma_k},$$

where the inequality follows from Lemma 2.2. Hence, by the definition of Γ_k , we have

$$\varepsilon_k \geq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\|A\|_F^2}, & k = 0, \\ \frac{1}{\gamma_1}, & k = 1, \\ \frac{1}{\gamma_2}, & k \geq 2. \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

Now, let us give an estimate for $\|Ax^{(k)} - b\|_2^2$. We have that for any $k \geq 0$, $x^{(k)} - x^* \in \text{Range}(A^\top)$. Indeed, from the definition of x^* , we know that $x^{(0)} - x^* = A^\dagger(Ax^{(0)} - b) \in \text{Range}(A^\top)$. Suppose that $x^{(k)} - x^* \in \text{Range}(A^\top)$ holds, then $w^{(k)} - x^* = x^{(k)} - x^* + \beta_k a_{i_{k-1}} \in \text{Range}(A^\top)$. Hence $x^{(k+1)} - x^* = w^{(k)} - x^* - \frac{a_{i_k}^\top w^{(k)} - b_{i_k}}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2} a_{i_k} \in \text{Range}(A^\top)$. By induction we have that $x^{(k)} - x^* \in \text{Range}(A^\top)$ holds for any $k \geq 0$. Therefore,

$$\|Ax^{(k)} - b\|_2^2 = \|A(x^{(k)} - x^*)\|_2^2 \geq \sigma_{\min}^2(A) \|x^{(k)} - x^*\|_2^2.$$

Substituting this and (14) into (12) and (13) completes the proof. \square

Remark 2.4. *It can be observed from (11) that the parameter β_k in Algorithm 1 is carefully chosen such that $\|x^{(k+1)} - x^*\|_2^2$ is minimized.*

Remark 2.5. *We note that in [31, Theorem 3.1], the authors had obtained the same convergence rate as that in Theorem 2.3 for the greedy randomized Kaczmarz method with oblique projection. However, the convergence result in [31, Theorem 3.1] is for the expectation $\mathbb{E}[\|x^{(k)} - x^*\|_2^2]$. It can be seen that our convergence result is for the quantity of $\|x^{(k)} - x^*\|_2^2$ and we refer to such convergence for random algorithms as deterministic.*

Remark 2.6. *In [29, Theorem 2.1], the authors showed that the iteration sequence $\{x^{(k)}\}_{k \geq 0}$ of the GRK method satisfies*

$$\|x^{(k)} - x^*\|_2^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\|A\|_F^2}{\gamma_1} + 1 \right) \frac{\sigma_{\min}^2(A)}{\|A\|_F^2} \right)^{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_{\min}^2(A)}{\|A\|_F^2}\right) \|x^{(0)} - x^*\|_2^2, \quad k \geq 1.$$

It is obvious that $\rho_2 < \rho_1 < \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\|A\|_F^2}{\gamma_1} + 1 \right) \frac{\sigma_{\min}^2(A)}{\|A\|_F^2} \right)$, which means that the convergence factor of Algorithm 1 in Theorem 2.3 is smaller, uniformly with respect to the iteration index, than that of the GRK method. In [17, Theorem 4.1], the authors showed that the iteration sequence $\{x^{(k)}\}_{k \geq 0}$ of the MIRK method satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[\|x^{(k)} - x^*\|_2^2] \leq \rho_1^{k-1} \rho_0 \|x^{(0)} - x^*\|_2^2, \quad k \geq 1.$$

Since $\rho_2 < \rho_1$, we have that Algorithm 1 achieves a better convergence factor compared to the MIRK method. Moreover, the linear convergence of Algorithm 1 is deterministic.

2.2. A geometric interpretation. In this subsection, we give several views of geometric interpretation of the multi-step inertial extrapolation approach. For any $i \in [m]$, we define the hyperplane

$$H_i = \{x \mid \langle a_i, x \rangle = b_i\},$$

and let

$$\Pi_k = x^{(k)} + \text{span}\{a_{i_k}, a_{i_{k-1}}\}.$$

The procedure of the multi-step inertial extrapolation approach consists of two steps. Starting from $x^{(k)}$, it first finds a specific point $w^{(k)}$ along the direction $a_{i_{k-1}}$, i.e. $w^{(k)} = x^{(k)} + \beta_k a_{i_{k-1}}$. Then, it projects $w^{(k)}$ onto the hyperplane H_{i_k} to obtain $x^{(k+1)}$. From (9) and (10), we know that the coefficient β_k is designed such that $x^{(k+1)}$ locates on the intersection of the two hyperplanes H_{i_k} and $H_{i_{k-1}}$. We present the geometric interpretation of the multi-step inertial extrapolation approach in Figure 1. Meanwhile, we know that

$$x^{(k+1)} = w^{(k)} - \frac{\langle a_{i_k}, w^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_k}}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2} a_{i_k} = x^{(k)} + \beta_k a_{i_{k-1}} - \frac{\langle a_{i_k}, w^{(k)} \rangle - b_{i_k}}{\|a_{i_k}\|_2^2} a_{i_k} \in \Pi_k.$$

Therefore, $x^{(k+1)} \in H_{i_k} \cap H_{i_{k-1}} \cap \Pi_k$. Let

$$V_1 = \text{span}\{a_{i_k}, a_{i_{k-1}}\} \text{ and } V_2 = \left\{ x \mid \begin{bmatrix} a_{i_{k-1}} \\ a_{i_k} \end{bmatrix} x = 0 \right\}.$$




FIGURE 1. A geometric interpretation of the multi-step inertial extrapolation approach. The next iterate $x^{(k+1)}$ is the projection of $w^{(k)} = x^{(k)} + \beta_k a_{i_{k-1}}$ onto the hyperplane H_{i_k} with β_k being chosen such that $x^{(k+1)}$ locates on the intersection of the two hyperplanes H_{i_k} and $H_{i_{k-1}}$.

It is easy to see that those two subspaces are orthogonal and hence $\{0\} = V_1 \cap V_2$. Since V_1 is parallel to Π_k and V_2 is parallel to $H_{i_k} \cap H_{i_{k-1}}$ which implies that the intersection $H_{i_k} \cap H_{i_{k-1}} \cap \Pi_k$ is a singleton. Overall, we obtain that

$$(15) \quad \boxed{\{x^{(k+1)}\} = (H_{i_k} \cap H_{i_{k-1}}) \cap \Pi_k.}$$

This geometric interpretation can also enlight other viewpoints. First, since $x^{(k+1)}$ is on Π_k and $x^* - x^{(k+1)} \in H_{i_k} \cap H_{i_{k-1}}$ is perpendicular to Π_k , i.e.

$$\langle x^* - x^{(k+1)}, y - x^{(k+1)} \rangle = 0, \quad \forall y \in \Pi_k,$$

then $x^{(k+1)}$ is the projection of x^* onto Π_k , i.e.

$$(16) \quad \boxed{x^{(k+1)} = \arg \min \|x - x^*\|_2^2 \text{ subject to } x = x^{(k)} + \tau_1 a_{i_k} + \tau_2 a_{i_{k-1}}, \tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathbb{R}.}$$

Simultaneously, $x^{(k+1)}$ is on $H_{i_k} \cap H_{i_{k-1}}$ and $x^{(k)} - x^{(k+1)} \in \Pi_k$ is perpendicular to $H_{i_k} \cap H_{i_{k-1}}$, i.e.

$$\langle x^{(k)} - x^{(k+1)}, y - x^{(k+1)} \rangle = 0, \quad \forall y \in H_{i_k} \cap H_{i_{k-1}}.$$

Thus $x^{(k+1)}$ is also the projection of $x^{(k)}$ onto $H_{i_k} \cap H_{i_{k-1}}$, i.e.

$$(17) \quad \boxed{x^{(k+1)} = \arg \min \|x - x^{(k)}\|_2^2 \text{ subject to } \langle a_{i_{k-1}}, x \rangle = b_{i_{k-1}}, \langle a_{i_k}, x \rangle = b_{i_k}.}$$

These three viewpoints are illustrated in Figure 2. Recall that the sketch-and-project [14, 15] update solves

$$\boxed{x^{(k+1)} = \arg \min \|x - x^{(k)}\|_B^2 \text{ subject to } S_{i_k}^\top Ax = S_{i_k}^\top b.}$$

Here $\|\cdot\|_B = \sqrt{\langle \cdot, B \cdot \rangle}$ with B being symmetric positive definite, and $S_{i_k} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times \tau}$ is the *sketching matrix* with sketching size τ . It is obvious that the multi-step inertial extrapolation approach provides a implementation for the above framework with B being an identity matrix and $S_{i_k} = [e_{i_k}, e_{i_{k-1}}]$, where e_i is the unit coordinate vector at the i -th axis.

Indeed, (15), (16), and (17) correspond to the *random-intersect* viewpoint, the *constrain-and-approximate* viewpoint, and the *sketch-and-project* viewpoint discussed in [15, Section 2] for the sketch-and-project method, respectively.




FIGURE 2. The next iterate $x^{(k+1)}$ is the only point in the intersection of $H_{i_k} \cap H_{i_{k-1}}$ and Π_k . It is the projection of x^* onto Π_k and meanwhile the projection of $x^{(k)}$ onto $H_{i_k} \cap H_{i_{k-1}}$.

We here also introduce another implementation that can be interpreted in such viewpoints, the oblique projection technique discussed in [22, 31]. When projecting $x^{(k)}$ onto the hyperplane H_{i_k} , the oblique projection does not use the orthogonal projection direction a_{i_k} . Instead, it uses a perturbed direction

$$d^{(k)} = a_{i_k} - \frac{\langle a_{i_k}, a_{i_{k-1}} \rangle}{\|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2} a_{i_{k-1}}$$

derived from a_{i_k} and it is orthogonal to $a_{i_{k-1}}$. Then setting $x^{(k+1)} = x^{(k)} + \eta_k d^{(k)}$ with η_k being designed to ensure that $x^{(k+1)}$ is on H_{i_k} . By the definition of $d^{(k)}$, we know that $x^{(k+1)}$ is also on the $H_{i_{k-1}}$. Besides, the next iterate $x^{(k+1)}$ satisfies

$$x^{(k+1)} = x^{(k)} + \eta_k d^{(k)} = x^{(k)} + \eta_k a_{i_k} - \eta_k \frac{\langle a_{i_k}, a_{i_{k-1}} \rangle}{\|a_{i_{k-1}}\|_2^2} a_{i_{k-1}} \in \Pi_k.$$

Thus $x^{(k+1)} \in H_{i_k} \cap H_{i_{k-1}} \cap \Pi_k$, which implies it is the same point that the multi-step inertial approach obtains. The procedure is illustrated in Figure 3.

3. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we describe some numerical results for the GMIRK method for solving linear systems. We also compare the GMIRK method with the GRK method on a variety of test problems. All methods are implemented in MATLAB R2022a for Windows 10 on a desktop PC with the Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-10710U CPU @ 1.10GHz and 16 GB memory.

In our implementations, to ensure the consistency of the linear system, we set $b = Ax^*$, where x is a vector with entries generated from a standard normal distribution. All computations are started from the initial vector $x^0 = 0$. We stop the algorithms if the relative solution error (RSE) $\frac{\|x^{(k)} - A^\dagger b\|_2^2}{\|A^\dagger b\|_2^2} \leq 10^{-12}$. All the results are averaged over 20 trials and we




FIGURE 3. A geometric explanation of the oblique projection technique. The next iterate $x^{(k+1)}$ is the projection of $x^{(k)}$ along the direction $d^{(k)}$ onto the hyperplane H_{i_k} .

report the average number of iterations (denoted as Iter) and the average computing time in seconds (denoted as CPU). We use $\text{Prob}(i_k = i) = \frac{|\tilde{r}_i^{(k)}|^2}{\|\tilde{r}^{(k)}\|_2^2}$ as the probability criterion for selecting the working row.

3.1. Synthetic data. In this test, we assign the entries of the coefficient matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ as independent identically distributed uniform random variables within the interval $[t, 1]$. It should be noted that varying the value of t will appropriately change the coherence of A . Besides, as the value of t approaches 1, the correlation between the rows of A becomes stronger, which means that the value of δ becomes larger.

Figures 4 and 5 illustrate the relationship between the CPU time, number of iterations, and the number of rows or columns of the matrix A for the GRK and GMIRK methods. From these figures, it can be observed that the GMIRK method requires significantly fewer iteration steps and less computing time compared to the GRK method. The performance of the GRK method is highly sensitive to changes in t , whereas the GMIRK method is not. As t increases, the number of iteration steps and the CPU time of the GRK method increase rapidly, while those of the GMIRK method remain relatively stable or even decrease (see Figure 4).

3.2. Real-world data. The real-world data are available via the SuiteSparse Matrix Collection [20]. The matrices used in the experiments include `bibd_16_8`, `crew1`, `WorldCities`, `nemsafm`, `model1`, `ash958`, `Franz1`, and `mk10-b2`. Some of these matrices are full rank, while others are rank-deficient. Each dataset consists of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and a vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. In our experiments, we only use the matrices A of the datasets and ignore the vector b . In Table 1, we report the number of iterations and the computing times for GRK and GMIRK. From this table, we can see that the GMIRK method outperforms the GRK method in terms of iterations across all tests. However, the GRK method may outperform the GMIRK method in terms of CPU time for `model1`, `ash958`, `Franz1`, and `mk10-b2`. This is because the GMIRK method requires more computational cost than GRK at each step.




FIGURE 4. Figures depict the CPU time (in seconds) and iteration vs increasing number of rows when $n = 100$. We set $t = 0.1, 0.5$, and 0.9 , respectively.




FIGURE 5. Figures depict the CPU time (in seconds) and iteration vs increasing number of columns when $m = 100$. We set $t = 0.1, 0.5$, and 0.9 , respectively.

TABLE 1. The average Iter and CPU of GRK and GMIRK for solving linear systems with coefficient matrices from SuiteSparse Matrix Collection [20].

Matrix	$m \times n$	rank	$\frac{\sigma_{\max}(A)}{\sigma_{\min}(A)}$	GRK		GMIRK	
				Iter	CPU	Iter	CPU
bibd_16_8	120×12870	120	9.54	2184.90	6.5448	1222.10	3.4363
crew1	135×6469	135	18.20	6142.70	2.5679	2477.70	0.8699
WorldCities	315×100	100	6.60	13880.20	1.4874	6165.20	0.7280
nemsafm	334×2348	334	4.77	2463.80	0.2280	2365.00	0.2275
model1	362×798	362	17.57	12063.90	0.7607	10814.00	0.8418
ash958	958×292	292	3.20	1618.00	0.0779	1579.50	0.0900
Franz1	2240×768	755	$2.74e+15$	15290.80	1.0779	14609.90	1.1703
mk10-b2	3150×630	586	$2.74e+15$	2335.50	0.2679	2328.70	0.3030

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper presented the GMIRK method, an accelerated variant of the randomized Kaczmarz method, for solving large-scale linear systems. The method combines two techniques: the greedy probability criterion and the multi-step inertial extrapolation approach. Moreover, we introduced a tighter threshold parameter for the greedy probability criterion. We showed that the GMIRK method converges faster than the GRK method in both theory and experiments. Furthermore, we elaborated the geometric interpretation of the multi-step inertial extrapolation approach, establishing its connection with sketch-and-project method [14, 15] as well as oblique projection technique [22].

In [21], Leventhal and Lewis have extended the randomized Kaczmarz method to solve the linear feasibility problem $Ax \leq b$. It would be interesting to explore the potential benefits of combining inertial extrapolation with the greedy probability criterion for solving the linear feasibility problem.

REFERENCES

- [1] Zhong-Zhi Bai and Lu Wang. On convergence rates of kaczmarz-type methods with different selection rules of working rows. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 186:289–319, 2023.
- [2] Zhong-Zhi Bai and Wen-Ting Wu. On greedy randomized Kaczmarz method for solving large sparse linear systems. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 40(1):A592–A606, January 2018.
- [3] Zhong-Zhi Bai and Wen-Ting Wu. On greedy randomized coordinate descent methods for solving large linear least-squares problems. *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.*, 26(4), August 2019.
- [4] Zhong-Zhi Bai and Wen-Ting Wu. On greedy randomized augmented Kaczmarz method for solving large sparse inconsistent linear systems. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 43(6):A3892–A3911, January 2021.
- [5] Zhong-Zhi Bai and Wen-Ting Wu. Randomized Kaczmarz iteration methods: Algorithmic extensions and convergence theory. *Jpn. J. Ind. Appl. Math.*, pages 1–23, 2023.
- [6] Charles Byrne. A unified treatment of some iterative algorithms in signal processing and image reconstruction. *Inverse Probl.*, 20(1):103–120, 2003.
- [7] Kai-Wei Chang, Cho-Jui Hsieh, and Chih-Jen Lin. Coordinate descent method for large-scale l2-loss linear support vector machines. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 9(7):1369–1398, 2008.
- [8] Jia-Qi Chen and Zheng-Da Huang. On a fast deterministic block Kaczmarz method for solving large-scale linear systems. *Numer. Algorithms*, 89(3):1007–1029, March 2022.
- [9] Q.L. Dong, J.Z. Huang, X.H. Li, Y.J. Cho, and Th. M. Rassias. MiKM: multi-step inertial Krasnosel’skiĭ–mann algorithm and its applications. *J. Global Optim.*, 73:801–824, 2019.
- [10] David L Donoho and Xiaoming Huo. Uncertainty principles and ideal atomic decomposition. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 47(7):2845–2862, 2001.
- [11] Hans Georg Feichtinger, C Cenk, M Mayer, H Steier, and Thomas Strohmer. New variants of the POCS method using affine subspaces of finite codimension with applications to irregular sampling. In *Visual Communications and Image Processing’92*, volume 1818, pages 299–310. SPIE, 1992.
- [12] Richard Gordon, Robert Bender, and Gabor T. Herman. Algebraic reconstruction techniques (ART) for three-dimensional electron microscopy and X-ray photography. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 29(3):471–481, 1970.
- [13] Robert M. Gower, Denali Molitor, Jacob Moorman, and Deanna Needell. On adaptive sketch-and-project for solving linear systems. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 42(2):954–989, January 2021.
- [14] Robert M. Gower, Denali Molitor, Jacob Moorman, and Deanna Needell. On adaptive sketch-and-project for solving linear systems. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 42(2):954–989, 2021.
- [15] Robert M. Gower and Peter Richtárik. Randomized iterative methods for linear systems. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 36(4):1660–1690, 2015.

- [16] Per Christian Hansen, Jakob Jørgensen, and William RB Lionheart. *Computed tomography: algorithms, insight, and just enough theory*. SIAM, 2021.
- [17] Songnian He, Ziting Wang, and Qiao-Li Dong. Inertial randomized Kaczmarz algorithms for solving coherent linear systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08185*, 2023.
- [18] Gabor T Herman and Lorraine B Meyer. Algebraic reconstruction techniques can be made computationally efficient (positron emission tomography application). *IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging*, 12(3):600–609, 1993.
- [19] S Kaczmarz. Angenäherte auflösung von systemen linearer gleichungen. *Bull. Int. Acad. Pol. Sic. Let., Cl. Sci. Math. Nat.*, pages 355–357, 1937.
- [20] Scott P Kolodziej, Mohsen Aznaveh, Matthew Bullock, Jarrett David, Timothy A Davis, Matthew Henderson, Yifan Hu, and Read Sandstrom. The suitesparse matrix collection website interface. *J. Open Source Softw.*, 4(35):1244, 2019.
- [21] Dennis Leventhal and Adrian S Lewis. Randomized methods for linear constraints: convergence rates and conditioning. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 35(3):641–654, 2010.
- [22] Weiguo Li, Qin Wang, Wendi Bao, and Lili Xing. Kaczmarz method with oblique projection. *Results Appl. Math.*, 16:100342, 2022.
- [23] Frank Natterer. *The mathematics of computerized tomography*. SIAM, 2001.
- [24] Deanna Needell and Rachel Ward. Two-subspace projection method for coherent overdetermined systems. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 19(2):256–269, 2013.
- [25] Yu-Qi Niu and Bing Zheng. A greedy block Kaczmarz algorithm for solving large-scale linear systems. *Appl. Math. Lett.*, 104:106294, 2020.
- [26] Andrei Patrascu and Ion Necoara. Nonasymptotic convergence of stochastic proximal point methods for constrained convex optimization. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 18(1):7204–7245, 2017.
- [27] Boris T Polyak. Some methods of speeding up the convergence of iteration methods. *Comput. Math. Math. Phys.*, 4(5):1–17, 1964.
- [28] Thomas Strohmer and Roman Vershynin. A randomized Kaczmarz algorithm with exponential convergence. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 15(2):262–278, April 2009.
- [29] Yansheng Su, Deren Han, Yun Zeng, and Jiaxin Xie. The linear convergence of the greedy randomized Kaczmarz method is deterministic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01988*, 2023.
- [30] Ruoyu Sun and Yinyu Ye. Worst-case complexity of cyclic coordinate descent: $O(n^2)$ gap with randomized version. *Math. Program.*, 185(1-2):487–520, 2021.
- [31] Fang Wang, Weiguo Li, Wendi Bao, and Li Liu. Greedy randomized and maximal weighted residual Kaczmarz methods with oblique projection. *Electron. Res. Arch.*, 30(4):1158–1186, 2022.
- [32] Wen-Ting Wu. On two-subspace randomized extended Kaczmarz method for solving large linear least-squares problems. *Numer. Algorithms*, 89(1):1–31, 2022.
- [33] Zi-Yang Yuan, Lu Zhang, Hongxia Wang, and Hui Zhang. Adaptively sketched Bregman projection methods for linear systems. *Inverse Probl.*, 38(6):065005, 2022.
- [34] Jian-Jun Zhang. A new greedy Kaczmarz algorithm for the solution of very large linear systems. *Appl. Math. Lett.*, 91:207–212, 2019.
- [35] Yanjun Zhang and Hanyu Li. Greedy capped nonlinear Kaczmarz methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.00653*, 2022.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, BEIHANG UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100191, CHINA.

Email address: `suyansheng@buaa.edu.cn`

LMIB OF THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, BEIHANG UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100191, CHINA.

Email address: `handr@buaa.edu.cn`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, BEIHANG UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100191, CHINA.

Email address: `zengyun@buaa.edu.cn`

LMIB OF THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, BEIHANG UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100191, CHINA.

Email address: `xiejx@buaa.edu.cn`