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Abstract

In this paper, we argue for the utility of deterministic inference in the classical problem of numerical linear algebra, that of solving a linear system. We show how the Gaussian belief propagation solver can be modified to handle non-symmetric positive definite matrices and introduce a new algorithm for matrix inversion that corresponds to the generalized belief propagation derived from the cluster variation method or Kikuchi approximation. We relate these algorithms to LU and block LU decompositions and provide some guarantees based on theorems from the theory of belief propagation. All proposed algorithms are compared with classical solvers (e.g., Gauss-Seidel, BiCGSTAB) for an examples of linear elliptic equations. Also, we show how Gaussian belief propagation can be used as multigrid smoother, resulting in a far more robust solver than the one based on the Gauss-Seidel iterative method.

1 Introduction

A basic problem of numerical linear algebra is to solve a linear equation

$$Ax = b$$

with an invertible matrix $A$. The best known direct technique is the LU decomposition which is equivalent to Gaussian elimination [9, ch. 3]. However, when $A$ is large and sparse, algorithms that exploit sparsity are used instead [6]. Among iterative family of methods for sparse systems, one can mention classical relaxation techniques such as Gauss-Seidel, Jacobi, Richardson, and projection methods such as conjugate gradients, generalized minimal residuals, biconjugate gradients, and others [21, 20].
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A straightforward way to understand projection methods is to reformulate the original equation as an optimization problem \([23]\). For example, for a symmetric matrix \(A\), one has

\[
x^* = \arg \min_x \left( \frac{x^T Ax}{2} - x^T b \right).
\] (2)

Such reformulation allows one to apply new techniques and leads to methods of steepest descent, conjugate directions, and cheap and efficient conjugate gradients \([11]\).

Another reformulation of the problem is known, but is less explored. It goes back to Gauss and his version of the Gauss elimination. To derive an LU solution of \([1]\), one can consider the normal distribution

\[
p(x) \sim \exp \left( -\frac{x^T Ax}{2} + b^T x \right)
\] (3)

Marginalization of the first variable corresponds to the subtraction of the Schur complement of \(A_{11}\) from the inverse covariance matrix of the remaining variables

\[
A_{22} \leftarrow A_{22} - \frac{A_{21} A_{21}}{A_{11}},
\] (4a)

\[
b_2 \leftarrow b_2 - \frac{A_{21} b_1}{A_{11}},
\] (4b)

which is a step of LU or, when \(x_1\) is not a scalar, but a subset of variables, a block LU decomposition \([24]\).

Thus, the most stable and popular direct technique is intimately connected with the marginalization problem which belongs to the class of inference problems. Because of this, it is reasonable to explore how other inference algorithms are translated to the realm of numerical linear algebra. Among them are expectation propagation \([15]\), Markov chain Monte Carlo, mean field, and other variational Bayesian approximations \([5\) chapter 8, chapter 10], \([28]\), and belief propagation with its generalized counterparts. The latter two are considered further in the present work.

The first comparison between classical methods and belief propagation, albeit not a systematic one, appeared in \([29]\). Then, in \([22]\), authors argued explicitly for the belief propagation as a solver and later Bickson \([4]\) presented a more systematic treatment of the Gaussian belief propagation (GaBP) in the same context. Among other proposed methods was an algorithm that treats nonsymmetric matrices through diagonal weighting \([4\) 5.4] and the usual trick from linear algebra, \(A \rightarrow A^T A\). Both techniques are of limited use because of slow convergence in the first case and fill-in in the second. We improve on these results and propose several new algorithms.

In particular, we

- explain how belief propagation can be applied to non-symmetric positive matrices with no computation overhead compared to the original (applicable to symmetric matrices) belief propagation (algorithm \([1]\):
design a family of linear solvers based on the generalized belief propagation (algorithm 2) and relate them to the block LU decomposition (see Section 4.3);

introduce a two layers region graph and derive generalized belief propagation rules (50) that are substantially less demanding computationally compared to the basic generalized belief propagation algorithm (see 58);

show how proofs of sufficient condition for convergence and consistency for the original GaBP should be modified to hold for the proposed algorithms (for GaBP see Sections 3.3, 3.2, for generalized GaBP – Sections 4.5, 4.6);

explain how one can speed up GaBP using multigrid methodology which results in a surprisingly robust solver (see figure 7);

implement the new algorithms [1] and benchmark them against several classical solvers.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The general description of how to treat the problem (1) as an inference problem together with the basic terminology and main facts about Gaussian belief propagation are introduced in Section 2. In addition, short Section 2.2 explains the connection between GaBP and Gaussian elimination. In Section 3 we introduce GaBP that can be used for non-symmetric matrices and prove consistency of proposed algorithm as well as the sufficient condition for convergence. In Section 4 extensions of the belief propagation are given: in 4.1 we describe the generalized belief propagation algorithm (GaBP) (parent-to-child in [35]); in 4.2 we derive message update rules for region graphs with two layers, and in 4.3 we discuss generalized GaBP from the elimination perspective and explain why the algorithm can be applied to the case $A^T \neq A$, resulting algorithm is introduced in Section 4.4 and analyzed in Sections 4.5, 4.6. Section 5 explains how to use GaBP within a multigrid scheme, we discuss smoothing properties, complexity and describe a very unusual behaviour for singularly perturbed elliptic equations. Section 6 contains numerical examples. In Section 7 we summarize the main results and discuss possible future research.

2 Gaussian belief propagation

2.1 Conventional belief propagation

Following [4, 22], we reformulate (1) as an inference problem. For this purpose, we consider a small subset of undirected graph models that is known as Gauss-Markov random fields. First, we define a pairwise Markov random field. The graph $\Gamma$ is the set of edges $E$ and vertices $V$. Each vertex $i$ corresponds to the random variable $x_i$ (discrete or continuous), and each edge corresponds to interactions between variables. The set of non-negative (integrable) functions $\{\phi_i, \psi_{ij}\}$ together with the graph $\Gamma$ completely specify the form of the
probability density function of a pairwise Markov random field

\[ p(x) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{i \in V} \phi_i(x_i) \prod_{(ij) \in E} \psi_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \equiv \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left( -E(x) \right). \] (5)

The normalization constant \( Z \) is known in statistical physics as a partition function. The second equation in (5) (that is the Gibbs distribution) should be considered as a definition of energy \( E(x) \). Gauss-Markov random field is a particular instance of a pairwise Markov model with a joint probability density function given by a normal distribution

\[ p(x) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left( -\frac{x^T A x}{2} + b^T x \right) \equiv \mathcal{N}(x|A^{-1}b, A^{-1}), \] (6)

where \( A \) is a symmetric positive-definite matrix. The edges of \( \Gamma \) correspond to the nonzero \( A_{ij} \), and the splitting on \( \phi_i \), \( \psi_{ij} \) is not unique. A common task in the inference process is a computation of a partial distribution, or a marginalization,

\[ p_r(x_r) = \sum_{x \setminus x_r} p(x). \] (7)

Integrals replace sums if \( x \in \mathbb{R}^N \). For Gauss-Markov model, marginal distributions are known explicitly and are given by

\[ p_i(x_i) = \mathcal{N}(x_i|_{A^{-1}b}_i, (A^{-1})_{ii}) \equiv \mathcal{N}(x_i|\mu_i, \beta_i). \] (8)

As the means of marginals for the model (6) coincide with the elements of the solution vector for (1), methods from the domain of probabilistic inference can be applied directly to obtain the solution. A popular algorithm that exploits the structure of the underlying graph to find the marginal distribution efficiently is Pearl’s belief propagation [16]. Pearl’s algorithm operates with local messages that spread from node to node along the graph edges, and beliefs (approximate or exact marginals) are computed as a normalized product of all incoming messages after the convergence. More precisely, belief propagation consists of (1) the message update rule

\[ m_{ij}(x_j) \leftarrow \sum_{x_i} \phi_i(x_i) \psi_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \prod_{k \in N(i) \setminus j} m_{ki}(x_i), \] (9)

where \( m_{ij} \) is a message from node \( i \) to node \( j \) and \( N(i) \) is the set of neighbours of the node \( i \), and (2) the formula for marginals

\[ b_i(x_i) \sim \phi_i(x_i) \prod_{k \in N(i)} m_{ki}(x_i). \] (10)

Although, for continuous random variables the problem of marginalization and the algorithm of belief propagation are harder, it is not the case for the normal distribution. Namely, for the Gauss-Markov model, one can parameterize
messages in the form of the normal distribution

\[ m_{ji}(x_i) \sim \exp \left( -\frac{\Lambda_{ji} (x_i - \mu_{ji})^2}{2} \right), \quad (11) \]

and explicitly derive update rules, means, and precision

\[
\mu_{ji}^{(n+1)} = b_j + \sum_{k \in N(j) \setminus i} \Lambda_{kj}^{(n)} \mu_{kj}^{(n)}, \quad \Lambda_{ji}^{(n+1)} = -\frac{A_{ij} A_{ji}}{A_{jj} + \sum_{k \in N(j) \setminus i} \Lambda_{kj}^{(n)}}, \quad (12)
\]

\[
\mu_i^{(n)} = \frac{b_i}{A_{ii}} + \sum_{j \in N(i)} \Lambda_{ji}^{(n)} \mu_{ji}^{(n)}, \quad \beta_i^{(n)} = A_{ii} + \sum_{j \in N(i)} \Lambda_{ji}^{(n)}.
\]

These update rules correspond to the flood schedule such that at the current iteration step, each node sends messages to all its neighbors based on messages received at the previous step. Equations for the mean and precision should be put to use only after saturation according to some criteria, for example \(|\mu_{ji}^{(n+1)} - \mu_{ji}^{(n)}| \leq \text{tolerance}\), and the same for \(\Lambda\). Rules (12) are collectively known as Gaussian belief propagation.

Belief propagation was designed to give an exact answer if \(\Gamma\) has no loops. In the presence of loops, the result appears to be approximate if delivered at all. In the case of GaBP, the situation is more optimistic. We briefly recall some useful facts about GaBP that we discuss later in more detail. If GaBP converges on the graph of arbitrary topology, the means are exact, but variances can be incorrect [20]. The best sufficient condition for convergence of the Gauss-Markov model with symmetric positive definite matrix can be found in [14], we discuss it later in great details. The fixed point of GaBP is unique [10]. On the tree, GaBP is equivalent to the Gaussian elimination [18].

Many different schemes that extend belief propagation and GaBP were developed [34], [17], [25], [15], [8]. Here, we are mainly interested in generalized belief propagation proposed in [34] and subsequently developed in [33], [32], [35]. This new algorithm is significantly more accurate [35, fig. 15] than Pearl’s algorithm, but at the same time it can be computationally involved. In next sections, we show how to use the generalized belief propagation in the context of numerical linear algebra.

### 2.2 GaBP from the elimination perspective

Ideas of this section are similar to those in [18], but the presentation is simpler and applies more generally.

It turns out that GaBP rules can also come from the pure linear algebra with no reference to the probability theory whatsoever. To explain that we consider
a simple system of equations

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
A_{ii} & A_{ij} & 0 \\
A_{ji} & A_{jj} & A_{jk} \\
0 & A_{kj} & A_{kk}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
x_i \\
x_j \\
x_k
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
b_i \\
b_j \\
b_k
\end{pmatrix}.
\] (13)

Suppose one wants to get a solution for the first variable only. To achieve that, we exclude the third variable from the second equation which gives an equivalent system

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
A_{ii} & A_{ij} & 0 \\
A_{ji} & A_{jj} - A_{kj}A_{jk}/A_{kk} & 0 \\
0 & A_{kj} & A_{kk}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
x_i \\
x_j \\
x_k
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
b_i \\
\left(b_j - A_{jk}b_k/A_{kk}\right) \\
b_k
\end{pmatrix}.
\] (14)

Now we eliminate the second variable too

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
A_{ii} - A_{ji}A_{ij}/A_{kk} \\
A_{ji} - A_{kj}A_{jk}/A_{kk} & A_{jj} - A_{kj}A_{jk}/A_{kk}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
x_i \\
x_j
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
b_i \\
\left(b_j - A_{jk}b_k/A_{kk}\right)
\end{pmatrix}.
\] (15)

The step left us with a scalar equation that is easy to solve. From the one hand, the whole process is known under the name of Gaussian elimination [24, ch. 3]. On the other hand, it is not hard to relate operations above with the messages of GaBP. Namely, if we write

\[
A_{jj} \leftarrow A_{jj} + A_{kj}A_{jk}/A_{kk},
\]

\[
b_j \leftarrow b_j + A_{kj}b_k/A_{kk},
\] (16)

and the same for variables \(x_i, x_k\), the update rules for messages as well as the answer for \(x_i\) coincide with the ones for GaBP [12]. From this perspective, one has no principal restriction on the matrix A as far as the Gaussian elimination (with pivoting) suits for the solution of any regular system. However, two problems remain:

- GaBP rules as given in (22) are not suitable even for the positive definite non-symmetric system as explained next,
- and there is no one-to-one mapping between Gaussian elimination’s operations and the ones of GaBP.

We address both issues in the next section.

3 GaBP for the non-symmetric linear system

3.1 The algorithm

As we explain before the GaBP rules can be understood as corrections to the right-hand side and the diagonal elements of the matrix under successive elimination of variables. It means that in principle one can apply the rules to solve at least specific non-symmetric systems. However, there is a problem which is
unique to the non-symmetric case. Namely, it is possible to have $A_{ij} = 0$ and $A_{ji} \neq 0$. In this situation, rules (12) lead to a singular result as far as $A_{ij}$ appears in the denominator. As far as the parametrization of messages is not unique both from the elimination and probabilistic perspectives, it is possible to redefine $\Lambda$ and $\mu$ in the following way

$$\mu_{ji}^{(n)} = \bar{\mu}_{ji}^{(n)}, \Lambda_{ji}^{(n)} = \bar{\Lambda}_{ji}^{(n)} A_{ji}. \tag{17}$$

Then update rules become

$$\bar{\mu}_{ji}^{(n+1)} = b_j + \sum_{k \in N(j) \setminus i} \bar{\Lambda}_{kj}^{(n)} \bar{\mu}_{kj}^{(n)}, \bar{\Lambda}_{ji}^{(n+1)} = -\frac{A_{jj}}{A_{jj} + \sum_{k \in N(j) \setminus j} \bar{\Lambda}_{kj}^{(n)} A_{kj}};$$

$$\mu_{i}^{(n)} = \frac{b_i + \sum_{j \in N(i)} \bar{\Lambda}_{ji}^{(n)} \bar{\mu}_{ji}^{(n)}}{A_{ii} + \sum_{j \in N(i)} \bar{\Lambda}_{ji}^{(n)} A_{ji}}, \beta_{i}^{(n)} = A_{ii} + \sum_{j \in N(i)} \bar{\Lambda}_{ji}^{(n)} A_{ji}. \tag{18}$$

Note that reparametrization (17) is not a good one in a way that it is not one-to-one if $A_{ji} = 0$. However, the quick look at the equations (13)-(15) assures us that indeed it is possible to define messages in that way. That is if $A_{jk} = 0$ one does not need to eliminate $x_k$ from the second equation so the message $\Lambda_{kj}$ is indeed zero.

The last definition before the algorithm description fixes the correspondence between directed graphs and non-symmetric matrices. For a given matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, we construct a graph with $N$ vertices $v \in V$ corresponding to the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_N$ and the set of directed edges $E$. The edge pointing from the vertex $j$ to the vertex $i$ belongs to the set of edges iff $A_{ij} \neq 0$, i.e. $A_{ij} \neq 0 \iff e_{ji} \in E$.

**Algorithm 1** GaBP for a non-symmetric system of linear equations.

Form directed graph $G = (V, E)$ based on $A$.

while error $>$ tolerance do
  for $j \in V$ do
    $m = b_j + \sum_{k \in N(j)} \bar{\Lambda}_{kj} \bar{\mu}_{kj}$
    $\Sigma = A_{jj} + \sum_{k \in N(j)} \bar{\Lambda}_{kj} A_{kj}$
    $x_j \leftarrow m / \Sigma$
  end for
  for $(j, i) \in E$ do
    $\bar{\mu}_{ji} \leftarrow -A_{ij} \bar{\mu}_{ij}$
    $\bar{\Lambda}_{ji} \leftarrow -A_{ij} / \left( \Sigma - \bar{\Lambda}_{ij} A_{ij} \right)$
  end for
  error $= \|Ax - b\|_\infty$
end while
The algorithm is sequential but can run in parallel after the apparent modifications. The stopping criteria can be different, for example, it is possible to use other norm, or error $= \|x^{(n+1)} - x^{(n)}\|_\infty$, or

$$\text{error} = \max\left(\|\tilde{\mu}^{(n+1)} - \tilde{\mu}^{(n)}\|_\infty, \|\tilde{\Lambda}^{(n+1)} - \tilde{\Lambda}^{(n)}\|_\infty\right).$$  \hfill (19)

Note that the update of $\tilde{\Lambda}$ decouples from the one for $\tilde{\mu}$. So it is possible to construct an algorithm that computes only messages for precisions and returns diagonal elements for the inverse matrix. We discuss how the algorithm of this kind can be utilized to speed up GaBP iterations in the section about generalized GaBP.

The speed of convergence, dependence on the condition number and the number of grid point both for the algorithm just described and iterations for the $\tilde{\Lambda}$ only are in the section with numerical examples.

### 3.2 Consistency

Here we, following [29], prove

**Proposition 1** If there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ that $\tilde{\mu}_e^{(N+k)} = \tilde{\mu}_e^{(N)}$, $\tilde{\Lambda}_e^{(N+k)} = \tilde{\Lambda}_e^{(N)}$ for all $e \in \mathcal{E}$ and for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\mu_i^{(N+k)} = \mu_i^{(N)} = (A^{-1}b)_i$.

In words, if there is a steady state under mapping (18), the solution given by the GaBP rules is exact.

The prove from [29] suits for the non-symmetric case too. Here we present a slightly different version of their arguments freed from references to graphical models for normal distribution.

The first concept that we need is a computation tree, which captures the order of operations under the GaBP iteration scheme. Computation tree contains copies of vertices and edges of the graph corresponding to $A$. The matrix is supposed to be fixed so the computation tree depends on the root node $i$ and the number of steps $n$. We denote it by $T_n(x_i)$. To get $T_n(x_i)$ from $T_{n-1}(x_i)$ we consider each vertex $m \in V_{T_{n-1}(x_i)}$ that has no incidence edges, find the corresponding variable on the graph of $A$, add to $T_{n-1}(x_i)$ copies of each neighbour $k$ of $m$ that $e_{km} \in \mathcal{E}_A$ but $l$ that $e_{ml} \in \mathcal{E}_{T_{n-1}(x_i)}$. The example of the tree $T_3(x_1)$ is in figure 1c the $T_2(x_1)$ in the dashed box exemplifies the recursion process.

By construction of the computation tree, the following proposition is true.

**Proposition 2** If $x_i^{(n)}$ is the solution on the $n$-th step of the algorithm [1] then it coincides with the one obtained after the elimination of all variables but $x_i$ (the root) from the computation tree $T_n(x_i)$.

To relate the matrix $B$ of the computation tree $T_n(x_i)$ with the matrix $A$ we define the matrix $O$ [29 eq. 15] that connects original variables with copies

$$y = Ox, \quad d = Ob,$$ \hfill (20)
or, more precisely, $y_j$ is a copy of $x_i \Rightarrow O_{ji} = 1$ and $\sum_i O_{ji} = 1$. For example, matrix $O$ for the tree in figure 1c is

$$
O^T = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}.
$$

(21)

Now it is not hard to establish the connection between $B$ and $A$ [29, eq. 17]

$$
BO + E = OA,
$$

(22)

where $E$ is nonzero only for the subset of variables that $n$ afar from the root node on the computation tree $T_n(x_i)$. The final part of the proof rests upon the following statement [29, Periodic beliefs lemma].

**Proposition 3** If there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ that $\tilde{\mu}_e^{(N+k)} = \tilde{\mu}_e^{(N)}$, $\tilde{\Lambda}_e^{(N+k)} = \tilde{\Lambda}_e^{(N)}$ for all $e \in E$ and for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then it is possible to construct and arbitrary large computation tree $T_M(x_i)$ for any root node $x_i$ with modified diagonal elements and right-hand side for the subset of variables that $M$ afar from the root that $O\mu^{(N)} = \tilde{B}^{-1}d$.

The critical part here is that not only the solution for the root node coincides with the steady state solution of GaBP, but the same is right for all variables on the modified computation tree.

The proof is straightforward. First following the recursion procedure, we construct a computation tree of desired depth $M$. Then we continue to grow the tree till the subtrees of nodes $M$ afar from the root reach the depth $N$ which corresponds to the steady state of GaBP. Now elimination of subtrees results in the desired modified tree with the matrix $B$ and the right-hand side $d$. 
Now as far as we can construct an arbitrary modified computation tree we can always get for arbitrary large $M$

$$\tilde{BO} = OA \text{ for the first } M \text{ rows.} \quad (23)$$

And we know that by construction of the modified computation tree

$$\tilde{BO} \mu^{(N)} = \tilde{d}.$$ \quad (24)

So we conclude that

$$OA \mu^{(N)} = Ob \text{ for the first } M \text{ rows.} \quad (25)$$

As far as $O^T O$ is a diagonal matrix that counts number of copies of each variable we can always choose $M$ large enough to make $\det (O^T O) \neq 0 \Rightarrow A \mu^{(N)} = b$ which means that iterative scheme defined by the algorithm 1 is consistent.

3.3 Convergence

Here we present the version of the proof from [14] that holds for non-symmetric matrices. Our corrections are relatively minor, but for the sake of logical coherence, we reproduce here the minimal set of arguments from [14] tuning definitions and proposition when needed. The main result of this section is

**Proposition 4** Let $A \succ 0$ and $|\tilde{R}|_{i,j} = (1 - \delta_{ij}) \frac{|A_{ij}|}{\sqrt{A_{ii}A_{jj}}}$, if $\rho(|\tilde{R}|) < 1$, then the algorithm 1 converges for any $b$ to the solution $x^* = A^{-1}b$.

The whole idea of the proof [14] is to relate GaBP operations with the recursive update of the weights of walks on the graph, corresponding to the matrix $A$. For the start we define a walk $w$ as an ordered set of vertices $w = (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_l(w))$ where $l(w)$ is a length of the walk $w$ and $\forall k < l(w) \Rightarrow e_{i_ki_{k+1}} \in E$. Each walk possesses a weight

$$\phi(w) = A_{i_l(w)i_{l(w)}-1} \cdots A_{i_3i_2}A_{i_2i_1}. \quad (26)$$

Note that the order is backward, which is a consequence of our definition of the directed graph. For the symmetric matrix, when the order is not essential, the equation [26] coincides with the weight defined in [14] 3.1. Now, if we have a system $Ax = b$, we can rescale it using $x_j = \frac{\tilde{x}_j}{\sqrt{A_{jj}}}$, $\tilde{b}_j = \frac{b_j}{\sqrt{A_{jj}}}$. This procedure is valid for any $A \succ 0$ and results in the equivalent system

$$\tilde{A} \tilde{x} = \tilde{b}, \quad \tilde{A}_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + (1 - \delta_{ij}) \frac{A_{ij}}{\sqrt{A_{ii}A_{jj}}} = \delta_{ij} - \tilde{R}_{ij} \quad (27)$$

It is possible to represent the solution of (27) in the form of Neumann series (see [12, ch. 5]) as far as

$$\rho (\tilde{R}) < 1 \Rightarrow \tilde{A}^{-1} = (I - \tilde{R})^{-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{R}^n. \quad (28)$$
However, for being able to rearrange terms in the sum as necessary, which is sufficient to rewrite the inverse matrix using walks, one need to demand an absolute convergence which is $\rho(\mathbf{R}) < 1$. Having this condition it is not hard to prove [14 Proposition 1, Proposition 5]

**Proposition 5** If $\rho(\mathbf{R}) < 1$, then $\mathbf{A}^{-1} = \sum_{w: j \rightarrow i} \phi(w)$ and $\bar{x}^*_i \equiv \left(\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{b}\right)_i = \sum_{k \in V} \sum_{w: k \rightarrow i} \phi(w)\bar{b}_k$, $x^*_i = \sqrt{\mathbf{A}_ii} \left(\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{b}\right)_i = \sqrt{\mathbf{A}_{ii}} \sum_{k \in V} \sum_{w: k \rightarrow i} \phi(w)\bar{b}_k$.

Here, by $w: j \rightarrow i$ we mean the set of walks which starts from the vertex $j$ and ends at the vertex $i$. If one defines [14 3.2] sets of single-visit $k \overset{i}{\rightarrow} i$ and single-revisit $i \overset{i}{\rightarrow} i$ walks by all walks which are not visiting the node $i$ in-between given start and end points, the sum over walks can be decomposed [14 eq. 12, 13; Proposition 9]

$$
\bar{x}^*_i = \left(\bar{b}_i + \sum_{k \in V} \left[\bar{b}_k \sum_{w: k \rightarrow i} \phi(w)\right]\right) / \left(1 - \sum_{w: i \rightarrow i} \phi(w)\right).
$$

(29)

The decomposition follows from "topological" considerations alone which depend only on the structure of walks and not on the particular definition of the weight. The last result that we need is [14 Lemma 18]

**Proposition 6** For each finite length walk $k \rightarrow j$ on directed graph of the matrix $A$ there is $n$ and unique walk on the computation tree $T_n(x_i)$.

Now, if we can relate an update rules (18) with the recursive structure of walks on a tree the proof of the proposition 4 is done.

On the tree, for each vertex $i$ the sum over single-revisit walks splits on sums over subtrees $T_{k,i}$, maximal connected part that contains $i$ and only $k$ among $N(i)$, namely

$$
\sum_{w: i \rightarrow i} \phi(w) = \sum_{k \in N(i)} \sum_{w: k \rightarrow i} \phi(w),
$$

(30)

but the sums over subtrees $T_{k,i}$ can be written as a sum over $T_{k\setminus i}$, maximal connected part that contains $k$, but does not contain $i$,

$$
\sum_{w: k \rightarrow k} \phi(w) = \frac{\bar{R}_{ki}}{1 - \sum_{w: k \rightarrow k} \phi(w)} = \frac{\bar{R}_{ki}}{1 - \sum_{m \in N(k) \setminus i} \sum_{w: k \rightarrow k} \phi(w)},
$$

(31)

where we used [14 eq. 12, Proposition 9]

$$
\sum_{w: k \rightarrow k} \phi(w) = \frac{1}{1 - \sum_{w: k \rightarrow k} \phi(w)}.
$$

(32)
Using the definition of $\tilde{R}$ it is easy to see that if one denote
\[
- \frac{A_{ii}}{A_{ki}} \sum_{w: i \leftarrow k, w \in T_{ki_{\rightarrow i}}} \phi(w) = \tilde{\Lambda}_{ki},
\]  
(33)
then an update rule (31) coincides with the one for $\tilde{\Lambda}$ in (18). Note that (33) is well defined as far as if $A_{ki} = 0$ there is no contribution from this particular subtree and we do not need to use the walk from there. In the same vein, the sum in the numerator of (29) can be decomposed
\[
\sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}} \left[ \tilde{b}_k \sum_{w: k \leftarrow i, w \in T_{m_{\rightarrow i}}} \phi(w) \right] = \sum_{m \in N(i)} \sum_{k \in T_{m_{\leftarrow i}}} \left[ \tilde{b}_k \sum_{w: k \leftarrow m, w \in T_{m_{\leftarrow i}}} \phi(w) \right].
\]  
(34)
Again, using the sum over subtrees $T_{m_{\leftarrow i}}$
\[
\sum_{k \in T_{m_{\leftarrow i}}} \left[ \tilde{b}_k \sum_{w: k \leftarrow m, w \in T_{m_{\leftarrow i}}} \phi(w) \right] = \tilde{R}_{im} \sum_{k \in T_{m_{\leftarrow i}}} \left[ \tilde{b}_k \sum_{w: k \leftarrow m, w \in T_{m_{\leftarrow i}}} \phi(w) \right],
\]  
(35)
decomposition on a single-visit walks [14, eq. 13] and equation 33, we obtain
\[
\frac{\tilde{\mu}_{mi}}{\sqrt{A_{ii}}} \tilde{\Lambda}_{mi} = \sum_{k \in T_{m_{\leftarrow i}}} \left[ \tilde{b}_k \sum_{w: k \leftarrow i, w \in T_{m_{\leftarrow i}}} \phi(w) \right] = \frac{\tilde{\Lambda}_{mi}}{\sqrt{A_{ii}}} \left( \tilde{b}_m + \sum_{l \in N(m) \setminus i} \sum_{k \in T_{l_{\leftarrow m}}} \left[ \tilde{b}_k \sum_{w: k \leftarrow m, w \in T_{l_{\leftarrow m}}} \phi(w) \right] \right).
\]  
(36)
The parametrization introduced in (36) leads to the same update rule for $\tilde{\mu}$ as in (18). With that, the sufficient condition, given in proposition 4, is established.

To make connections with the classical theory of iterative methods, we give another (less general) sufficient condition.

**Proposition 7** If $A$ is the M-matrix (see [20, Definition 1.30, Theorem 1.31]), algorithm 7 converges for any $b$ to the solution $x^* = A^{-1}b$.

The proof is straightforward. For M-matrix $\rho(I - D^{-1}A) < 1$, $A_{ij} \leq 0$, $i \neq j$ and $A_{ii} > 0$, where $D$ is a diagonal of $A$. It means that $\tilde{R} = I - D^{-1}A = |\tilde{R}|$ and $\rho(|\tilde{R}|) < 1$. 
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4 Generalized GaBP solvers

4.1 Parent-to-child schedule

We present a particular version of the parent-to-child schedule from [35] applied to the pairwise Markov graphical models.

First, we define a region \( r \) as a connected subgraph of the original graph \( \Gamma \). Each vertex \( a_1 \) in the region graph is a region that may be connected by a directed edge with another vertex \( a_2 \) if \( a_2 \subset a_1 \). The direction of the edge is from a larger region to smaller. If there is a directed edge from \( a \) to \( b \), then \( a \) is a parent of \( b \), and \( b \) is a child of \( a \). If the vertices \( a \) and \( b \) are connected by a directed path starting from \( a \), then \( a \) is an ancestor of \( b \), and \( b \) is a descendent of \( a \). The set of all vertices of the factor graph is \( \mathcal{R} \), the set of all edges is \( \mathcal{E}_R \), the set of all parents, children, ancestors, descendants of \( a \) are \( P(a), C(a), A(a), \) and \( D(a) \), respectively. We supplement each region \( r \in \mathcal{R} \) with a counting number,

\[
c_r = 1 - \sum_{i \in A(r)} c_i, \tag{37}
\]

and demand for each vertex \( v \in \mathcal{V} \) and each edge \( e \in \mathcal{E} \) of the original graph to be counted exactly once,

\[
\sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}, v \in r} c_r = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}, e \in r} c_r = 1. \tag{38}
\]

The definition of a counting number (37) and condition (38) may look arbitrary, but in fact they are justified in the framework of the cluster variation method [17] or the Kikuchi approximation [13]. Equation (38) is a result of the Möbius inversion formula applied to the sum over partially ordered sets [3], and (38) can be proven using definitions of Möbius and Zeta functions [3, equation 16].

An example of the region graph is presented in figure 2. For example, by region 5689, we mean all nodes and all links between them that are present on
the original graph. It is easy to see that the counting number condition (38) is satisfied for all the links and nodes.

The last two definitions that we need are the shadow of the region $S(r) = D(r) \cup r$ and a Markov blanket of the region $B(r) = P(S(r)) \setminus S(r)$. An example of both the shadow and Markov blanket of region 5689 can be found in figure 2b.

A parent-to-child algorithm consists of three elements: (1) messages that propagate along the directed edges of the region graph

$$ m_{a \rightarrow b}(x_b), $$

where $x_b$ corresponds to variables belong to the cluster $b$, (2) a formula for the cluster beliefs

$$ b_r(x_r) \sim \prod_{i \in V_r} \phi_i(x_i) \prod_{(ij) \in E_r} \psi_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \prod_{a \in B(r), b \in S(r)} m_{a \rightarrow b}(x_b), $$

and (3) message update rules that follow from the consistency conditions

$$ \forall l, r \in R, l \subset r \Rightarrow \sum_{x_r \setminus x_l} b_r(x_r) = b_l(x_l). $$

In [35, equation 114], one can find message update rules for the general situation, but for our simple region graph, conditions (41) suffice.

### 4.2 Generalized two layers GaBP

In this section, we consider the simplest possible valid region graph that consists of two layers. The example can be found in figure 3b. The large regions, the horizontal and vertical stripes in 3a, are parents of small regions presented by the individual nodes. To proceed, we need to establish some further notation.
First, we define a projector on the region $k$,

$$(\Pi_k)_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
\delta_{ij}, & i, j \in k, \\
0, & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases} \quad (42)$$

Here, $|j| = |k|$ and $|i| > |k|$ is chosen to be comfortable depending on the context. Ordering is global, i.e. it is fixed for the whole graph and maintained the same way in all manipulations. We also introduce brackets,

$$\Pi_k^T A \Pi_k = [A]_k, \quad \Pi_k^T b = [b]_k; \quad (43a)$$

$$\Pi_k C \Pi_k^T = [C]_k, \quad \Pi_k b = [b]_k; \quad (43b)$$

where $C \in \mathbb{R}^{|k| \times |k|}$ and according to our notation, the sizes of the matrix and the vector (43b) depend on the context whereas in (43a) the size of the matrix is $|k| \times |k|$ and the size of the vector is $|k|$. Let $\{L_i\}$ and $\{l_i\}$ be sets of large and small regions in the two-layer region graph. For messages, we use the following parameterizations

$$m_{ab}(x_b) = \mathcal{N}(x_b | \mu_{ab}, \Lambda^{-1}_{ab}) = \mathcal{N}(x_b | \mu_{ab}, \Sigma_{ab}) \quad (44)$$

According to (40), the belief of any region reads

$$b_L(x_L) = \mathcal{N}(x_L | \Sigma_L m_L, \Sigma_L), \quad (45a)$$

$$m_L = [b]_L + \sum_{a \in B(L)} \sum_{b \in S(L)} A_{ab} \mu_{ab} \left[ b \right]_L, \quad (45b)$$

$$\Sigma_L = \left( [A]_L + \sum_{a \in B(L)} \sum_{b \in S(L)} A_{ab} \left[ b \right]_L \right)^{-1}. \quad (45c)$$

For the small region $l$, the shadow is $S(l) = l$ and the Markov blanket is $B(l) = P(l)$, whereas for the large region $L$, the shadow is $S(L) = C(L)$ and the Markov blanket is $B(L) = P(C(L)) \setminus L$. Consistency condition (41) allows one to derive update rules for each message sent from the parent region to the child region,

$$m_{aL}(x_L) = \int \frac{dx_L}{dx_l} \mathcal{N}(x_L | \Sigma \bar{b}, \bar{\Sigma}), \quad (46a)$$

$$\bar{b} = [b]_L - [b]_l + \sum_{a \in B(L)} \sum_{b \in S(L) \setminus l} A_{ab} \mu_{ab} \left[ b \right]_L, \quad (46b)$$

$$\bar{\Sigma} = \left( [A]_L - [A]_l + \sum_{a \in B(L)} \sum_{b \in S(L) \setminus l} A_{ab} \left[ b \right]_L \right)^{-1}. \quad (46c)$$

\(^1\)For example in the equation $A + \Pi_k B \Pi_k^T$, the dimensionality of the second matrix is $|A|$.  
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Using standard results for marginals of the normal distribution, we can deduce
\[ \Lambda_{LL} = \left( \hat{\Sigma}_L \right)_l^{-1}, \quad \mu_{LL} = \hat{\Sigma}_b, \]
(47)

If region \( L \) has many children and \(|l| \ll |L|\), the direct use of equation (46c) is not efficient. Instead, we use the formula following from the Woodbury matrix identity,
\[
\left( (A + |B|)_l \right)_l^{-1} = \left( \left( \hat{\Lambda}^{-1} \right)_l^{-1} + |B|_l \right)_l^{-1},
\]
(48a)

\[
\left( (A + |B|)_l \right)_l^{-1} (b + |c|_l)_l = \left( \left( \hat{\Lambda}^{-1} \right)_l^{-1} + |B|_l \right)_l^{-1} \left( \left( |A|^{-1} \right)_l^{-1} |A|^{-1} b + |c|_l \right),
\]
(48b)

and split for each child region \( l \),
\[
\tilde{b} = \left( |b|_l + \sum_{a \in B(L)} |a|^{-1} b_{a} \right) - \left( |b|_l + \sum_{a \in B(L)} |a|^{-1} b_{a} \right) = \tilde{b}_0 - \tilde{b}_l,
\]
(49a)

\[
\tilde{\Sigma}^{-1} = \left( |A|_L + \sum_{a \in B(L)} |A|_a \right)_l^{-1} - \left( |A|_l + \sum_{a \in B(L)} |A|_a \right)_l = \tilde{\Lambda}_0 - \tilde{\Lambda}_l.
\]
(49b)

Then, for precision and mean of messages, we obtain
\[
\Lambda_{LL} = \left( \left( \hat{\Lambda}_0^{-1} \right)_l^{-1} - \tilde{\Lambda}_l \right),
\]
(50a)

\[
\mu_{LL} = \Lambda_{LL}^{-1} \left( \left( \hat{\Lambda}_0^{-1} \right)_l^{-1} \left( \hat{\Lambda}_0^{-1} b_0 \right)_l - \tilde{b}_l \right).
\]
(50b)

Equations (50) are especially useful in the situation when the small regions consist of the single node, i.e. the case of graph in figure 3. In this situation, one needs to invert the matrix corresponding to the large region only once whereas the direct application of (47) leads to \(|C(a)|\) inversions.

From formulae (50), one can derive GaBP rules. As the large regions in the Bethe approximation consist of two vertices with the edge connecting them, we can rewrite messages as
\[
\Lambda_{(ij)i} \equiv \Lambda_{ji}, \quad \mu_{(ij)i} \equiv \mu_{ji}.
\]
(51)
Then, the Gaussian belief propagation rules follow from

\[ \tilde{\Lambda}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} A_{ii} + \sum_{k \in N(i) \setminus j} \Lambda_{ki} & A_{ij} \\ A_{ji} & A_{jj} + \sum_{k \in N(j) \setminus i} \Lambda_{kj} \end{pmatrix}, \]

(52a)

\[ \tilde{\Lambda}_i = A_{ii} + \sum_{k \in N(i) \setminus j} \Lambda_{ki}, \]

(52b)

\[ \tilde{\Lambda}_i \begin{bmatrix} i \\ j \end{bmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{ii} + \sum_{k \in N(i) \setminus j} \Lambda_{ki} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \]

(52c)

The validity of the presented rules for non-symmetric linear problems does not follow from the derivation above. Nevertheless, one can apply the generalized GaBP rules with no modifications to solve them. We explain why that is so in the next sections.

4.3 Elimination perspective

First, we define a hypergraph \( G \) based on the region graph. The set of nodes coincides with the set of large regions, and each common child corresponds to the edge in the graph. The example of such a hypergraph is shown in figure 3c. With this definition, messages from equations (46) can be redefined with no reference to the small region as long as a one-to-one correspondence between edges of \( G \) and child regions of the original region graph are established. Now we study the single message from region \( j \) to region \( i \) with \( k = j \cap i \) and \( j = j \setminus k \).

According to (46) and (47), the precision part of the message is

\[ \Lambda_{ji} = \left( \left( \begin{pmatrix} A_{jj} & A_{jk} \\ A_{kj} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right)^{-1} \right)_{kk} = -A_{kj}^{-1}A_{jk}, \]

(53)

and the mean is

\[ \mu_{ji} = \left( \begin{pmatrix} A_{jj} & A_{jk} \\ A_{kj} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} b_j \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = -\Lambda_{ji}^{-1}A_{jk} \Lambda_{jj}^{-1}b_j. \]

(54)

So the subset \( k \) of \( A_i \) and \( b_i \) receive a correction from region \( j \),

\[ \Delta (A_i)_{kk} = -A_{kj}A_{jk}^{-1}A_{jj}, \]

(55a)

\[ \Delta (b_i)_{k} = -A_{kj}A_{jk}^{-1}b_j. \]

(55b)

The corrections above are the same as in the ordinary block LU decomposition,

\[ \begin{pmatrix} A_{jj} & A_{jk} \\ A_{kj} & A_{kk} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ A_{kj}A_{jk}^{-1} & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_{jj} & 0 \\ 0 & A_{kk} - A_{kj}A_{jk}^{-1}A_{jj} \end{pmatrix}. \]

(56)
Thus we have a correspondence between the block LU operations and the gen-
eralized GaBP for the two layers region graph. As in the case of the ordinary
GaBP, LU applies in the fashion of dynamic programming, i.e., one does not
just solve a smaller subproblem like in the block iterative scheme, but rather
form a recursive procedure that decouples different blocks from each other.

Again, one should reparametrize messages for them to be valid for the arbi-
trary positive definite matrix $A$. The problem is if $A_{jk} = 0$, $\Lambda_{ji}$ is not invertible
and it need not, because in this case $A_i$ does not receive corrections $\Delta(A_i)_{kk}$.
The reparametrization for the mean messages $m_{Ll} \equiv \Lambda_{Ll} \mu_{Ll}$ solves this prob-
lem. Other inverses are well defined as for positive definite matrices all proper
submatrices are positive definite too.

4.4 The algorithm

In case of generalized GaBP messages propagate on the region graph. We remind
that $\{L_i\}$ is the set of large regions and $\{l_i\}$ is the set of small regions.

**Algorithm 2** Generalized two layers GaBP for a non-symmetric system of
linear equations.

For a given two layers region graph $G = \{R, E_R\}$.

while error $>$ tolerance do

for $L \in \{L_i\} \subset R$ do

$\bar{b}_0 = [b]_L$

$A_0 = [A]_L$

for $l \in C(L)$ do

$\bar{b}_0 \leftarrow b_0 + \sum_{L' \in P(C(l)) \setminus L} |m_{L'L}|_l$

$\bar{A}_0 \leftarrow \bar{A}_0 + \sum_{L' \in P(C(l)) \setminus L} |A_{L'L}|_l$

end for

$[x]_L \leftarrow A_0^{-1} \bar{b}_0$

for $l \in C(L)$ do

$m_{Ll} \leftarrow \left(\left[A_0^{-1}\right]_l\right)^{-1} [x]_l - [b]_l - \sum_{L' \in P(C(l)) \setminus L} m_{L'L}$

$A_{Ll} \leftarrow \left(\left[A_0^{-1}\right]_l\right)^{-1} - [A]_l - \sum_{L' \in P(C(l)) \setminus L} A_{L'L}$

end for

end for

error $= \|Ax - b\|_\infty$

end while

An algorithm, as we describe it in this section, acts on a given region graph.
We do not provide an algorithm or recommendations on how to build a region
graph. Some observations about the influence of a particular choice of large
regions can be found in the section with numerical examples as well as the speed of convergence for different equations and matrices with various condition numbers. Regarding complexity, for each region, one needs to solve a linear system of $|L|$ equations, and, also, find a submatrix of the inverse matrix of the size $|L| \times |L|$. We do not specify a way how to do that. But generally, the former task is hard to accomplish asymptotically faster than the whole inverse, so computational costs of the entire scheme depend mostly on this operation. That is why in what is following most of the time we consider region graphs with small regions each of which contains the single node. In this situation, one can avoid fill-in and estimate only the diagonal of the inverse matrix which is usually more straightforward. Also, there is no need for additional inverse step during the message update. Moreover, when all small regions are single nodes, the whole algorithm is either a scheme that speeds up GaBP or a particular schedule of GaBP depending on the chosen ways of finding the inverse and the solution of a linear system.

To perform a worst-case analysis both of an algorithm 2 and update rules (50) we, for a given region with $N$ variables, denote the number of children by $M$, the number of variables of each child region by $n_i$, the number of parents for each child by $p_i$, and use LU decomposition to find an inverse. For the algorithm 2 the number of operations is

$$\#_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \left[ \frac{3}{2} n_i^3 + 2n_i (n_i + 1) (p_i - 1) \right] + \frac{3}{2} N^3. \quad (57)$$

The first term in brackets is due to an inverse during the message update stage, the second term in brackets is due to message update and message accumulation steps, the last term is from the inverse of a matrix for a large region. For update rules (50) we get

$$\#_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \left[ \frac{3}{2} n_i^3 + (M - 1)n_i (n_i + 1) (p_i - 1) \right] + M \frac{3}{2} N^3. \quad (58)$$

As far as

$$\#_2 - \#_1 = (M - 3) \sum_{i=1}^{M} n_i (n_i + 1) (p_i - 1) + (M - 1) \frac{3}{2} N^3, \quad (59)$$

one gets a speed up if $M > 3$ for arbitrary region graph. For some regular partitions, for example, the ones in figures 3a and 4a, $M$ scales like $N$, in those cases an algorithm 2 performs $O(N^3)$ operations whereas rules (50) performs $O(N^4)$ operations for each large region.

It is easy to see that if LU is employed, the number of operations for the single sweep is $O(K)$, where $K$ is an overall number of variables, only if the number of variables, for some regular partition for which the limit makes sense, in each large region scales like $O(1)$. Needless to say that LU is not the best option all the time, for example, matrices can have a particular structure (tridiagonal as
Figure 4: Partitions that we use in the Section 6. Case (a) is called “thick stripes” and case (b) “split”. For case (b), edges between 3, 7, 11, 15 are excluded in the right region to reduce the complexity.

in figure 5a, or it can be more advantageous to use probing or other techniques of estimation certain subblocks of the inverse matrix [26] in combination with some iterative scheme for the solution of linear system.

4.5 Consistency

Here we prove that two layers generalized GaBP is consistent.

Proposition 8 If there is \( N \in \mathbb{N} \) that
\[
\mathbf{m}_e^{(N+k)} = \mathbf{m}_e^{(N)}, \quad \mathbf{A}_e^{(N)} = \Lambda_e^{(N)}
\]
e \in \mathcal{E}_R and for any \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), then for each large region \( \{x\}_L \equiv \widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_0^{-1}\mathbf{b}_0 = [\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{b}]_L 
\) (see Algorithm 2 for details).

The idea of the proof is the same as for the ordinary GaBP. One needs to relate, considering the operations of generalized GaBP, equations that generalized GaBP solves during the \( N \)-th step, with the original system of linear equations, and then shows that those systems coincide for sufficiently large \( N \) if steady state exists.

To do so, we introduce a flat version of the region graph (an example is in figure 5b) that provided less detailed information about parent-child structure. Flat region graph is an undirected graph \( \{V, E\} \), where \( V \) is the set of large regions and \( (L, L') \in E \) if \( L \) and \( L' \) has at least one common child (the example is in figure 5b).

Now one can introduce the computation tree exactly in the same way as for GaBP. The only difference is that, because of an overlap between large regions, when we add a leaf node, we include overlapping variables to the root node. An example of the computation tree \( T_3(B) \) as well as the \( T_2(B) \) is in figure 5c. By construction of the computation tree we know that the following is true.
Figure 5: (a) – partition of an original graph on large regions; (b) – flat representation of two layers region graph; (c) – computation tree for generalized GaBP.

**Proposition 9** Elimination of all variables on the computation tree $T_N(B)$ leads to the solution $x_B$ that coincides with the one on the $N$-th step of generalized GaBP.

The relation between the matrix $B$, corresponding to the computation tree, and the original matrix $A$ is the same as in the equation (22) if one introduces the matrix $O$

$$O_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } y_i \text{ is the copy of } x_j, \\
0 & \text{otherwise}. 
\end{cases} \quad (60)$$

Here $x$ are variables on the graph of the matrix $A$, and $y$ are the ones on the computation tree.

Having the same relation between $A$ and $B$, we can repeat the rest of the proof, using the same arguments as in Section 3.2. So it follows that generalized GaBP is consistent and proposition 8 is true.

### 4.6 Convergence

In this section we present a sufficient condition for convergence of two layers generalized GaBP. First, based on a given region graph $(R, E_R)$, we define a set of variables subsets $F \equiv \left( \bigcup \{ l_i \} \right) \bigcup \left( \bigcup \left\{ L_j \right\}_{j=1}^{p} \bigcup \left\{ \{ l_p \} \right\}_{p=1}^{C(L_j)} \right)$, where $l_i$ is a small region and $L_j$ is a large region. Using $F$, we form a partition of the matrix $A$ and the right hand side vector $b$

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{ii} & A_{ij} & \ldots \\ A_{ji} & A_{jj} & \ldots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}, b = \begin{pmatrix} b_i \\ b_j \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix}, \quad (61)$$
where each diagonal block corresponds to the element of the set $F$. We also define

$$\tilde{A}_{ij} = A^{-1}_{ii} A_{ij} \equiv I_{ij} - \tilde{R}_{ij},$$

$$\|\tilde{R}\|_{ij} = \|\tilde{R}_{ij}\|, \tilde{b}_i = A^{-1}_{ii} b_i.$$  \hfill (62)

To avoid possible confusions, we add that the second line contains a definition of the matrix $\|\tilde{R}\|$, which depends on the operator norm $\|\cdot\|$ (see [12, ch. 5, Definition 5.6.3]). The following statement gives sufficient condition for convergence.

**Proposition 10** If for a given region graph $\{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}_R\}$ exists an operator norm $\|\cdot\|$ for which $\rho(\|\tilde{R}\|) < 1$, then two layers generalized GaBP (algorithm 2) converges to the exact solution $x = A^{-1}b$.

The proof consists of two parts. In the first one we show that single-visit and single-revisit walks on a tree possess the same update rules as generalized GaBP messages. In the second part, we show that it is always possible to reorganize walks on the graph arisen from the partition $F$ to restore each walk on a computation tree.

### 4.6.1 Walk structure on a tree

To complete the first part we, for a given partition $F$ of a matrix $A$, define the weight of a walk $w = (i_1i_2\ldots i_L)$ by the product of matrices

$$\phi(w) = \tilde{R}_{i_Li_{L-1}} \ldots \tilde{R}_{i_3i_2} \tilde{R}_{i_2i_1}. \hfill (63)$$

As far as the standard result [2, ch. 8, Theorem 8.9] on absolute convergence in complete finite metric spaces allows to rearrange terms of the sum, we can formulate the following statement.

**Proposition 11** If $\rho(\|\tilde{R}\|) < 1$, then

$$\left(\tilde{A}^{-1}\right)_{ii} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\tilde{R}^n\right)_{ii} = \sum_{w:i\rightarrow i} \phi(w),$$

$$x_i = \sum_{j \in V} \left(\tilde{A}^{-1}\right)_{ij} \tilde{b}_j = \sum_{j \in V} \sum_{w:j\rightarrow i} \phi(w)\tilde{b}_j.$$  \hfill (64)

Here we used the same definition for the set of walks as in the Section 3.3. Again, [14 eq. 12, 13] allows us to rewrite diagonal blocks of the inverse matrix and the solution vector using single-visit and single-revisit walks

$$\left(\tilde{A}^{-1}\right)_{ii} = \left(I_{ii} - \sum_{w:i\rightarrow i} \phi(w)\right)^{-1},$$

$$x_i = \left(\tilde{A}^{-1}\right)_{ii} \left(\tilde{b}_i + \sum_{j \in V} \sum_{w:j\rightarrow i} \phi(w)\tilde{b}_j\right).$$
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As far as on the tree we can split sums on contributions from subtrees $T_{k,i}$ for each $k \in N(i)$, by comparison with algorithm 2 we can deduce

$$
\sum_{j \in T_{k,i}} \sum_{w: j \rightarrow i} \phi(w) \tilde{b}_j = (A_{ii})^{-1} m_{ki}, \quad \sum_{w: k \rightarrow i} \phi(w) = -(A_{ii})^{-1} A_{ki}. \quad (65)
$$

Messages in algorithm 2 propagate along edges of the region graph, whereas messages that we have just defined flow along edges of a graph of the matrix $\tilde{R}$. To have a more straightforward connection between them, we consider $\tilde{R}$ as a matrix originates from the computation tree itself. Under this set of circumstances, there is a one-to-one correspondence between messages (65) and the ones in algorithm 2.

For single-revisit walks one has

$$
\sum_{w: k \rightarrow i} \phi(w) = (A_{ii})^{-1} A_{ik} \sum_{w: k \rightarrow i} \phi(w) (A_{kk})^{-1} A_{ki} =
$$

$$
= (A_{ii})^{-1} A_{ik} \left( I_{kk} - \sum_{w: k \rightarrow i} \phi(w) \right)^{-1} (A_{kk})^{-1} A_{ki} \Rightarrow \quad (66)
$$

$$
\Rightarrow \Lambda_{ki} = -A_{ik} \left( A_{kk} + \sum_{m \in N(k) \setminus i} A_{mk} \right)^{-1} A_{ki}.
$$

If we consider the following matrix

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & A_{ik} \\
A_{ki} & \left( A_{kk} + \sum_{m \in N(k) \setminus i} A_{mk} \right)
\end{pmatrix}^{-1}
$$

one can immediately see that update rules (66) indeed coincides with (47).

For single-visit walks we have

$$
\sum_{j \in T_{k,i}} \sum_{w: j \rightarrow i} \phi(w) \tilde{b}_j = - (A_{ii})^{-1} A_{ik} \sum_{j \in T_{k,i}} \sum_{w: j \rightarrow k} \phi(w) \tilde{b}_j =
$$

$$
= - (A_{ii})^{-1} A_{ik} \left( I_{kk} - \sum_{w: k \rightarrow i} \phi(w) \right)^{-1} \left( \tilde{b}_k + \sum_{j \in T_{k,i}} \sum_{w: j \rightarrow k} \phi(w) \tilde{b}_j \right), \quad (68)
$$
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or, using \((65)\), we get

\[
\mathbf{m}_{ki} = -A_{ik} \left( A_{kk} + \sum_{m \in N(k) \setminus i} A_{mk} \right)^{-1} \left( b_k + \sum_{p \in N(k) \setminus i} \mathbf{m}_{pk} \right).
\] (69)

As far as \(\mathbf{m}_{ki} = \Lambda_{ki} \mu_{ki}\) and

\[
\mu_{ki} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ A_{ki} \end{pmatrix} \left( A_{kk} + \sum_{m \in N(k) \setminus i} A_{mk} \right)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} b_k \\ \sum_{p \in N(k) \setminus i} \mathbf{m}_{pk} \end{pmatrix}.
\] (70)

we recover update rules \((47)\). So we conclude that on the computation tree update rules for two layers generalized GaBP coincide with recursive relations for single-visit and single-revisit walks.

### 4.6.2 Walk-sums and the graph refinement

The second part of the proof establishes the connection between sets of walks on the graph of the matrix \(\mathbf{R}\) and walks on the computation tree. First for the matrix \((61)\) we split a single region \(i\) into two parts \(i_1\) and \(i_2\)

\[
\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{i_1i_1} & A_{i_1i_2} & A_{i_1j} & \cdots \\ A_{i_2i_1} & A_{i_2i_2} & A_{i_2j} & \cdots \\ A_{j_1i_1} & A_{j_1i_2} & A_{jj} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{b} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{b}_{i_1} \\ \mathbf{b}_{i_2} \\ \mathbf{b}_{j} \end{pmatrix}.
\] (71)

The transformation of the graph is in figure \([6]\). We refer to this procedure as to the elementary refinement of the region \(i\). From the construction of the refined matrix \(\mathbf{A}\) the next proposition follows.
Proposition 12 There is a one-to-one correspondence between walks on the graph of $\tilde{R}$ and the one obtained by the elementary refinement of the region $i$ excluding three situations: 1) walk crosses $i$, 2) walk ends at $i$, 3) walk starts at $i$.

We discuss each of this situation separately. Before the start, we need to introduce a new notation. Let $k \xrightarrow{M} l$ be the set of walks, where each walk starts from $k$, ends at $l$ and newer leaves the subset $M$. It is easy to see that on the refined graph

$$\phi\left(k \xrightarrow{\{i_1, i_2\}} l\right) = \left((A_{ii})^{-1}\right)_{lk} A_{kk}, \text{ where } l, k = \{i_1, i_2\}. \quad (72)$$

- Walk on $\tilde{R}$ that crosses $i$ it has a form $w_{\text{cross}} = (\ldots ji \ldots)$ (see figure 6a). The weight of this walk is

$$\phi(w_{\text{cross}}) = \ldots (A_{kk})^{-1} A_{ki} (A_{ii})^{-1} A_{ij} \ldots. \quad (73)$$

On the refined graph we can consider the set of all walks that coincides with $w$ outside $i$. The sum of weight of all this walks is

$$\phi(w)_{\text{refined}} = \sum_{l, k \in \{i_1, i_2\}} \ldots (A_{kk})^{-1} A_{kl} \phi\left(l \xrightarrow{\{i_1, i_2\}} k\right) (A_{ll})^{-1} A_{lj} \ldots. \quad (74)$$

We see that due to equation (72) weights are the same.

- Walk on $\tilde{R}$ that ends at $i$ has a form $w_{\text{end}} = (\ldots ji \ldots)$ and a weight

$$\phi(w) = (A_{ii})^{-1} A_{ij} \ldots. \quad (75)$$

On the refined graph we have two set of walks

$$\phi(w)^p_{\text{refined}} = \sum_{l \in \{i_1, i_2\}} \phi\left(l \xrightarrow{\{i_1, i_2\}} p\right) (A_{ll})^{-1} A_{lj} \ldots, \ p \in \{i_1, i_2\} \quad (76)$$

that can be combined to have the same weight. Namely, using (72) we find that

$$\left[(A_{ii})^{-1} A_{ij} \ldots\right]_{l^*} = (\phi(w)_{\text{refined}})^l, \ l = \{i_1, i_2\}. \quad (77)$$

- Walk on $\tilde{R}$ that starts at $i$ has a form $w_{\text{start}} = (ij \ldots)$ and a weight

$$\phi(w_{\text{start}}) = \ldots (A_{jj})^{-1} A_{ji}. \quad (78)$$

It is possible to relate this walk to two sets of walk $w_1 = (i_1 j \ldots)$, $w_2 = (i_2 j \ldots)$ on the refined graph multiplying by the corresponding inverse matrices

$$\left((\phi(w_{\text{start}})(A_{ii})^{-1}\right)_{xl} = \sum_{k = \{i_1, i_2\}} \left((\phi(w_k)\phi\left(l \xrightarrow{\{i_1, i_2\}} k\right) (A_{ll})^{-1}\right)_{xl}, \quad (79)$$
where \( l = \{i_1, i_2\} \). The reweight is needed because the original linear system and the refined one are multiplied by different block diagonal matrices and have different inverses.

We know the following propositions to be true.

**Proposition 13** Any computation tree can be, by the set of elementary refinements, turned to a computation tree of GaBP under a proper schedule (see discussion before [14, Lemma 18]) operating on the graph of the matrix \( \hat{R} \) partitioned according to \( F \).

**Proposition 14** For each walk on the graph of the matrix \( \hat{R} \) there is a unique walk on sufficiently large computation tree formed by a proper schedule.

Hence for each walk on the computation tree, it is always possible to find a unique set of walks on the graph of the matrix \( \hat{R} \) that has the same weight after the multiplication by an appropriate inverse matrix (see [79]). It allows us to conclude that if it is possible to define a walk-sum for matrix \( \hat{R} \) (see proposition [11]), walk-sum on the computation tree converges too, so the proposition [10] is proven.

The simple corollary of above considerations is the following proposition.

**Proposition 15** Whenever GaBP converges (proposition [4]), generalized GaBP (algorithm \( \hat{R} \)) converges too.

The opposite does not hold. For example consider a matrix

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix}
10 & 1.5 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\
2 & 4 & 2.5 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\
2 & 3 & 5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
2 & 0 & 0 & 10 & 0.5 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 2 & 0 & 0.5 & 5 & 0 & 1 \\
2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 7 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\( A_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}, \ A_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}, \ A_{33} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}. \)

In this case the spectral radius of the matrix \( \hat{R} \) defined in proposition [4] equals \( \approx 1.03 \) and GaBP diverges. On the other hand, the spectral radius of \( \hat{R} \) defined by equation (62) and the partition given in equation (80) is smaller than one for \( l_\infty \) ([12, Example 5.6.5]) and the spectral ([12, Example 5.6.6]) norms.

5 GaBP as a smoother for the multigrid scheme

The most straightforward view on the geometric multigrid is to describe it as an acceleration scheme for classical iterative methods. For completeness, we provide a brief introduction here.
Multigrid consists of four essential elements: a projection operators $I_{V'}: V \rightarrow V'$ ($V$, $V'$ are linear spaces) that reduce the number of degrees of freedom, an interpolation operators $I_{V'}: V' \rightarrow V$ that act in the "inverse" way, a smoothing operators $S_{V'}: V \rightarrow V$ which are usually a classical relaxation methods, and a set of linear operators $A_{V'}$ that approximate $A$ on coarse spaces $V'$. What we describe next is a two grid cycle.

- For the current approximation $x^n$ for the original equation $Ax = b$ one performs a few relaxation steps $x = Sx^n$.
- Then, based on properties of $S$, the linear space $V'$ and the projection operator $I_{V'}: V \rightarrow V'$ are constructed. The purpose of this space is to represent the residual $r = b - Ax$ and an error $e = x_{\text{exact}} - x$ accurately using less degrees of freedom $|V'| < |V|$.
- Having the space $V'$, one constructs an operator $A'$ that approximate $A$ and solve an error equation $A'e' = I_{V'}r$.
- Error, after the projection back to $V$, gives the next approximation to the correct solution $x^{n+1} = S^nu (x^n + I_{V'}e')$.

The multigrid utilizes two grid cycle to solve an error equation $A'e' = I_{V'}r$ itself. It produces the chain of spaces (grids in the geometric setup), projection operators that allows moving between them, and a set of approximate linear operators. For more details we refer the reader to other resources: the simple introduction to geometric multigrid can be found in [21, ch. 13], for algebraic multigrid consider the relatively new review [31], the physical considerations about algebraic multigrid can be found in the introduction of [19], among other books on the subject [27] provides a comprehensive introduction for practitioners.

Here we consider only linear systems of equations arising from finite difference discretization of elliptic equation with smooth coefficients in two space dimensions. In this case it is possible to use grids in place of linear spaces. Let the finest grid contains $2^J + 1$ points $G_J = \{(i + j)h| h = 2^{-J}, i, j = 0, 1, \ldots 2^J\}$, then the coarser grid $G_{J-1}$ contains each second points along both directions. As far as we are working in the physical space, restriction operator $I_{V'}$ computes a weighted average of neighbouring points, operator $I_{V'}$ performs interpolation and $A$ on the grid $G_J$ is a finite difference approximation of the differential operator. In this article we always use full weighting restriction [27, eq. 2.3.3] and bilinear interpolation [27, eq. 2.3.7].

The smoother should be a mapping $S: x^n \rightarrow x^{n+1}$. Although GaBP is not of this form, one can use an error correction scheme as explained in algorithm 3. In the next two subsections we analyze smoothing properties of algorithm 3 and estimate its computational complexity.
Algorithm 3 GaBP as a smoother.

Compute a residual $r^n = b - Ax^n$.
Apply $\mu$ sweeps of algorithm 1 or 2 to the linear system $A\mathbf{e} = r^n$.
Perform an error correction $x^{n+1} = x^n + \mathbf{e}^\mu$.

5.1 Local Fourier Analysis

Local Fourier Analysis allows to compute spectral radius of a two grid cycle, smoothing factor of the relaxation scheme and an error contraction in a chosen norm [27, ch. 4]. In this subsection we apply it to the central difference discretization of the Laplace equation in two spatial dimensions

$$\frac{1}{h^2} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 4 & -1 \\ 4 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} u_{ij} = f_{ij}. \quad (81)$$

If after the $\mu$ sweeps of algorithm 1 the solution has a form $S r^n$ then the output of algorithm 3 is $x^{n+1} = S \left(b - Ax^n\right) + x^n$. So for an error we have

$$e^{n+1} = \left(I - SA\right) e^n. \quad (82)$$

Now we need to find a stencil of the operator $S$. For GaBP it differs for parallel and sequential versions. For one and two sweeps of parallel version on the infinite lattice we have

$$S_{\text{parallel}}^1 u_{ij} = \frac{h^2}{4} u_{ij}, \quad S_{\text{parallel}}^2 u_{ij} = \frac{h^2}{12} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 4 & 1 \\ 4 & 1 \end{bmatrix} u_{ij}. \quad (83)$$

It is easy to compute symbols

$$S_{\text{parallel}}^1(\theta) = \frac{h^2}{4}, \quad S_{\text{parallel}}^2(\theta) = \frac{h^2}{12} \left(1 + \cos \left(\frac{\theta_1 + \theta_2}{2}\right) \cos \left(\frac{\theta_1 - \theta_2}{2}\right)\right), \quad A(\theta) = \frac{4}{h^2} \left(1 - \cos \left(\frac{\theta_1 + \theta_2}{2}\right) \cos \left(\frac{\theta_1 - \theta_2}{2}\right)\right). \quad (84)$$

As far as the smoothing factor is

$$\mu = \max_{\theta \in \text{high}} \left|1 - S(\theta) A(\theta)\right|, \quad \text{high} = [-\pi, \pi]^2 \setminus \left[-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right]^2, \quad (85)$$

we can conclude that parallel version of GaBP shows no smoothing properties. This conclusion is confirmed by our numerical experiments.

In the sequential case one can deduce the form of $S$ based on elimination perspective. When one starts to move along the lattice, messages correspond to the elimination of variables, which means

$$S_{\text{sequential}}^{-1} = \frac{1}{h^2} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 4 \\ 4 & -1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (86)$$
Figure 7: Convergence histories for different anisotropies $\epsilon$: (a) two GaBP sweeps and (b) three GaBP sweep for presmoothing and postsmoothing. In both cases, the fine grid consists of $2^6 + 1$ points, and the coarsest grid consists of $2^3 + 1$ points along each coordinate line. For comparison, if $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$ multigrid with Gauss-Seidel smoother (3 presmoothing and postsmoothing sweeps) converges after $\sim 400$ iterations. Sharp drops of the residual are the result of the cumulative effect that eludes explanation via Local Fourier Analysis. For small epsilon vertical lines are effectively decoupled from each other. Scheme (a) needs 15 iterations to solve exactly systems of linear equations for each line, and scheme (b) need 10 iterations. See text for details.

Then for smoothing factor we have

$$\mu = \max_{\theta \in \text{high}} \sqrt{\frac{\cos(\theta_1 - \theta_2) + 1}{4 \cos(\theta_1) + 4 \cos(\theta_2) - \cos(\theta_1 - \theta_2) - 9}} = \frac{1}{2}$$

(87)

for $\theta_2 = \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\theta_1 = 2 \arctan \frac{1}{3}$. This mean that smoothing factor for sequential GaBP coincides with the one for sequential Gauss-Seidel iteration scheme [27, Example 4.3.4]. It is also clear that for the anisotropic problem

$$\frac{1}{h^2} \begin{bmatrix} -\epsilon & 2(1 + \epsilon) & -\epsilon \\ -1 & -\epsilon \\ -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} u_{ij} = f_{ij}$$

(88)

both Gauss-Seidel scheme and sequential GaBP lose their smoothing properties if $\epsilon \to 0$. However, experimental results (figure 7) show that the converge rate of GaBP does not depend on $\epsilon$. An explanation for this particular case is straightforward.

For sufficiently small $\epsilon$ equations for each vertical line are independent. GaBP is exact solver for trees. The single multigrid iteration eliminate variables from $2 + 2 = 4$ neighbours in case 7a and from $3 + 3 = 6$ neighbours in case 7b. When messages cover the whole line of $2^6 - 1 = 63$ nodes, system of linear equation for each vertical line is solved exactly. It gives us $63/4 \sim 15$ iterations for 7a and $63/6 \sim 10$ iterations for 7b.
The effect on figure 7 is a manifestation of the dynamic nature of GaBP. Even as a part of multigrid it maintains information about all previous iterations. More convergence histories can be found in the section with numerical examples. Overall we can conclude that sequential GaBP as a part of multigrid behaves similar to Gauss-Seidel in the absence of anisotropy, but far more robust in its presence. The behaviour captured in figure 7 (as well as in figure 12) also illustrates that Local Fourier Analysis is not an appropriate tool to analyze GaBP.

### 5.2 Reducing the computational complexity

Number of floating point operations per iteration for algorithms 1, 2 depends on the graph of the matrix $A$. Here we consider the operator with the dense stencil

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
  * & * & *
  
  * & * & *
  
  * & * & *
\end{bmatrix},
\]

which can originate from the second order finite difference approximation of differential operator that contains second and first derivatives. For convenience we split an algorithm 1 (sequential version) intro three parts:

- **Accumulation stage.** When $\Sigma$ and $m$ are computed.
- **Update stage.** When new messages $\tilde{\Lambda}$ and $\tilde{\mu}$ are constructed based on the previous ones.
- **Termination stage.** When the final answer $m_\Sigma$ shows up.

We also neglect all effects from boundary. Under these assumptions the number of floating point operations for the single sweep GaBP is

\[
\#_{\text{GaBP}} = 4N + 8N + 8N + 12N + \frac{N}{2} + 18N + \frac{N}{2} + N = 52N.
\]

Here we perform only a half of accumulation stage and a half of update stage because we do not need to receive messages from nodes that we have not visited yet, nor we need to send messages to already visited noted.
Figure 8: Here one can see how an error changes with the spacing \( h = (N_{\text{inner}} + 1)^{-1} \), for the solution of equation (92). Slopes on log-log plots reflect the second order of finite difference approximation. Figure (a) shows an error for means, i.e. the solution of \( Ax = b \). Figure (b) displays an error for variances, i.e. \( (A^{-1})_{ii} \).

For lexicographical Gauss-Seidel scheme the computational complexity is \( \#_{\text{LEX GS}} = 18N \). It means that a single sweep of \( 1 \) takes slightly less floating point operation than three sweeps of Gauss-Seidel smoother \( \#_{\text{GaBP}} \sim 3\#_{\text{LEX GS}} \). For \( M \) sweep of GaBP one has \( \#_{\text{GaBP}_M} = N(64M - 12) \). In the context of multigrid it is important to have a cheap smoother but even \( 52N \) is too much. However, it is possible to reduce computational complexity precomputing all required messages \( \tilde{\Lambda} \), which depend only on the matrix \( A \) and not on the right hand side vector. For \( M \) sweep of GaBP with precomputed \( \tilde{\Lambda} \) we have \( \#_{\text{GaBP}_M} = N(24M + 8) \). We sum up all results regarding the complexity of GaBP for practical cases in the table 1.

6 Numerical examples

As a model linear problem, we consider the matrices obtained from the finite difference (second order, central stencils) discretization of the boundary value problem defined within the square \( (x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 \). Linear operators are of the form

\[
L[a, b, \alpha, \beta] = a(x, y) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + b(x, y) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} + \alpha(x, y) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \beta(x, y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y}.
\] (91)

There are five solvers that we use: “GaBP” refers to the fully parallel GaBP (algorithm 1), “sequential GaBP” refers to the GaBP where new messages are used immediately after the update, “stripes” is an algorithm 2 with the partition that can be found in figure 3, “thick stripes” and “split” are partitions shown in figure 4.
Figure 9: Figure (a) exemplifies how many iterations are needed depending on the condition number. If \( K \) is a condition number and \( N \) is a number of iteration till convergence, the dependence is well approximated by the equation \( N = r_1 + r_2 K \). Values of the slope \( r_2 \) are in brackets after the name of iteration scheme. Figure (b) shows how the condition number evolves with the change of \( \beta \) in equation (93).

The consistency is demonstrated on the following boundary value problem

\[
L_1 [\cdot] = L[\cdot|a_1, b_1, \alpha_1, \beta_1], e(x, y) = \cos(\pi x) \cos(\pi y);
\]

\[
a_1 = e^{-x(y+2)} + 10, \alpha_1 = \cos \left( \pi \left( x + \frac{y}{2} \right) \right) \cos(2\pi x) + 4;
\]

\[
b_1 = e^{-2x+2y} \cos^2 \left( 2\pi \left( 2x + \frac{y}{2} \right) \right) + 3, \beta_1 = e^{2x-2y};
\]

\[
L_1[u(x, y)] = L_1[e(x, y)], u(x, y)|_{\partial\Gamma} = e(x, y)|_{\partial\Gamma}.
\]

Equation (92) is also used to show how the speed of convergence depends on a number of grid points (see [10]). It is interesting that the belief propagation
Figure 10: Figure (a) demonstrates how the speed of convergence changes with the number of inner points (degrees of freedom). The dependence resembles the one for the condition number. We discuss previously that for both algorithms 1, 2 iterations for variances decouple from iteration for means. Figure (b) shows how the number of points affects the speed of convergence for variance messages only.

that estimates diagonal blocks of the matrix inverse is optimal (figure 10b). The complexity $O(N)$ persists for any elliptic equations with smooth coefficients that we used for tests.

Results for the boundary value problem

\[
L_3[\cdot] = L[\cdot|a_3, b_3, \alpha_3, \beta_3|, c(x, y) = \cos(\pi x) \cos(\pi y);
\]

\[
a_3 = e^{-xy} + \alpha, \alpha_3 = \cos\left(\frac{\pi x}{2}\right) \cos(2\pi x);
\]

\[
b_3 = e^{-2x+2y} + e^{-2x-2y}, \beta_3 = e^{2x-2y};
\]

\[
L_3[u(x, y)] = L_3[e(x, y)], u(x, y)|_{\partial\Gamma} = e(x, y)|_{\partial\Gamma},
\]

is in figure 11 When $\alpha = 50$, the matrix is diagonally dominant, whereas when $\alpha = 0$, this is not the case. We see that some partitions leads to the outstanding convergence. Moreover, it is clear that it is always possible to choose regions for generalized GaBP to outperform any given iterative solver. In our case, splitting the whole domain into two parts leads to very fast convergence. However, we should remind that “split” is a decoupling scheme rather then solver. In our implementation inverse matrices in the algorithm 2 are computed using LU. It means that each iteration of “split” costs $O(N^3)$, whereas each iteration of BiCGSTAB costs $O(N)$.

To show that GaBP is more robust as a smoother in the multigrid scheme we consider two elliptic equations. The first one with the large coefficient before
The convection term
\[ L_4[A] = L[A_4, b_4, \alpha_4, \beta_4], e(x, y) = \cos(\pi x) \cos(\pi y); \]
\[ a_4 = e^{-xy}, \quad \alpha_4 = \cos\left(\pi \left( x + \frac{y}{2} \right) \right) + 90; \]
\[ b_4 = e^{-2x+2y}, \quad \beta_4 = e^{2x-2y}; \]
\[ L_4[u(x, y)] = L_4[e(x, y)], \quad u(x, y)|_{\partial\Gamma} = e(x, y)|_{\partial\Gamma}. \] (95)

Convergence history is in figure 12a. The second equation contain a relatively large anisotropy that does not align with coordinate lines.

\[ L_5[A] = L[A_5, b_5, \alpha_5, \beta_5], e(x, y) = \cos(\pi x) \cos(\pi y); \]
\[ a_5 = (1 - \cos(30\pi xy)) + 10^{-4}, \quad \alpha_5 = 0; \]
\[ b_5 = (1 + \cos(30\pi xy)) + 10^{-4}, \quad \beta_5 = 0; \]
\[ L_5[u(x, y)] = L_5[e(x, y)], \quad u(x, y)|_{\partial\Gamma} = e(x, y)|_{\partial\Gamma}. \] (96)

See figure 12b for convergence history. In case of regular elliptic equations, Gauss-Seidel and GaBP usually converge after the same number of iterations.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced a family of new linear solvers that are based on the generalized belief propagation algorithm valid for non-symmetric as well as symmetric matrices. We showed how to reduce the complexity of the resulting algorithm compare to the naive application of the generalized belief propagation. We established a clear connection between the block LU decomposition and the new algorithm, modify known proof to hold for non-symmetric matrices and provide two new proofs for block version of GaBP. Also, we showed, that one can use geometric multigrid to speed up GaBP, which, if one precompute \( \Lambda \),...
Figure 12: Graphs show the performance of GaBP as a multigrid (V-cycle) smoother in comparison with Gauss-Seidel iterative scheme. We choose the number of smoothing steps for both solvers to have roughly the same amount of floating point operations for a single sweep. That is one presmoothing/postsmoothing step in case of GaBP, and two in case of Gauss-Seidel. The fine grid consists of $2^6 + 2$ points along each direction. For (a) the coarsest grid contains $2^3 + 2$ points along each direction, for (b) the coarsest grid has 5 points. (a) corresponds to the equation (95), and (b) – to the equation (96).

results in a robust solver with the same computational complexity as for the one based on Gauss-Seidel smoother.

Although we provide statements about sufficient condition for convergence and consistency, we still lack the proof of necessary and sufficient condition as well as a reasonable estimation of the convergence rate.

Another important theoretical problem is the choice of clusters. Papers [30] and [33] contain some considerations, but for the Gauss-Markov random field, the answer probably should contain the information about the precision matrix $\mathbf{A}$ which is not done in [30, 33]. The choice certainly has a significant effect on convergence and smoothing properties and should not be made based on the complexity considerations alone. Also, clusters should be important for the design of algebraic multigrid based on generalized GaBP.

The behavior of GaBP in the context of geometric multigrid indicates that features of dynamic programming can be combined with hierarchical grids. Our simple approach that utilizes an error correction scheme should be replaced by a more efficient version that project messages in place of an approximate solution vector. It is not clear how to do that, but we expect a considerable improvement in convergence speed in case the algorithm of this kind comes up.

Finally, to the best of our knowledge, there is currently no work considering the general relationship between deterministic or probabilistic inference and linear solvers. We believe, such a link can provide us with a new interpretation of old algorithms and possibly lead to more efficient algorithms for numerical linear algebra.
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