A PARALLEL-IN-TIME ALGORITHM FOR HIGH-ORDER BDF METHODS FOR DIFFUSION AND SUBDIFFUSION EQUATIONS
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Abstract. In this paper, we propose a parallel-in-time algorithm for approximately solving parabolic equations. In particular, we apply the k-step backward differentiation formula, and then develop an iterative solver by using the waveform relaxation technique. Each resulting iteration represents a periodic-like system, which could be further solved in parallel by using the diagonalization technique. The convergence of the waveform relaxation iteration is theoretically examined by using the generating function method. The approach we established in this paper extends the existing argument of single-step methods in Gander and Wu [Numer. Math., 143 (2019), pp. 489–527] to general BDF methods up to order six. The argument could be further applied to the time-fractional subdiffusion equation, whose discretization shares common properties of the standard BDF methods, because of the nonlocality of the fractional differential operator. Illustrative numerical results are presented to complement the theoretical analysis.
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1. Introduction. The aim of this paper is to develop a parallel-in-time (PinT) solver for high-order time stepping schemes of diffusion models. We begin with the normal diffusion, which is described by parabolic equations.

Let \( V \subset H' \subset V' \) be a Gelfand triple of complex Hilbert spaces. Namely, the embedding \( V \hookrightarrow H \) is continuous and dense, and

\[
\langle u, v \rangle = (u, v), \quad \forall u \in H \hookrightarrow V', \forall v \in V \hookrightarrow H,
\]

where \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) is the duality pairing between \( V' \) and \( V \), and \((\cdot, \cdot)\) is the inner product on \( H \). Throughout, we let \( \| \cdot \| \) and \( \| \cdot \|_V \) denote the norms of the space \( H \) and \( V \), respectively.

Let \( T > 0, v \in H, f \in L^2(0, T; V') \), and consider the initial value problem of seeking \( u \in L^2(0, T; V) \cap H^1(0, T; V') \hookrightarrow C([0, T]; H) \) such that

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t u(t) + Au(t) &= f(t), \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T], \\
u(0) &= v,
\end{align*}
\]

where \( A : V \rightarrow V' \) is a self-adjoint bounded linear operator with the following elliptic property:

\[
\beta_0 \| u \|_V^2 \leq \langle Au, u \rangle \leq \beta_1 \| u \|_V^2, \forall u \in V,
\]

with constants \( \beta_1 > \beta_0 > 0 \). For example, if we consider a heat equation on a bounded Lipschitz domain \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( A \) denotes negative Laplacian \( -\Delta \) with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions, then \( H = L^2(\Omega) \) and \( V = H^1_0(\Omega) \).

In recent years, the development and analysis of parallel algorithms for solving evolution problems have attracted a lot of attention. The first group of parallel schemes is based on the inverse Laplace transform, which represents the solution as a contour integral in the complex plane and a carefully designed quadrature rule [34, 46, 53, 58]. Such a method is directly parallelizable and accurate even for a nonsmooth problem data. However, this strategy is not directly applicable for the nonlinear problem or anomalous diffusion problems with time-dependent diffusion coefficients. To the second group belongs the widely used parareal algorithm [3, 13, 15, 43, 69], which could be derived as a multigrid-in-time method or a multiple shooting method in the time direction. See also the space-time multigrid method [22, 24, 40, 59, 56]. We refer the
interested reader to survey papers \cite{11, 51} and references therein.

Very recently, in \cite{16}, Gander and Wu developed a novel PinT algorithm, by applying the waveform relaxation \cite{17, 19} and a diagonalization technique \cite{12, 14, 18}. In particular, they proposed a simple iteration: for given \( u_{m-1}(T) \in H \), look for \( u_m \) such that

\[
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial_t u_m(t) + Au_m(t)}{\kappa} &= f(t), \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T]; \\
u_m(0) &= v + \kappa(u_m - u_{m-1})(T).
\end{aligned}
\]  

(1.3)

Here \( \kappa \) denotes a relaxation parameter. Note that the exact solution \( u \) is a fixed point of the iteration (1.3). It was proved in \cite{16} Theorem 3.1 that, by selecting a proper \( \kappa \in (0, 1) \), the iteration (1.3) converges with the convergence factor \( \kappa e^{-cT} / (1 - \kappa e^{-cT}) \), where \( c \) is the smallest eigenvalue of \( A \) and \( c \geq \beta_0 \).

Then, a direct discretization of (1.3) by the backward Euler method immediately results in a periodic-like discrete system, and therefore the diagonalization technique is applicable here to carry out a direct parallel computation. The diagonalization technique was firstly proposed by Maday and Ronquist for solving evolution models \cite{12}. The basic idea is to reformulate the time-stepping system into a space-time parallel computation. Like discrete system, and therefore the diagonalization technique is applicable here to carry out a direct discretization (1.3) to (1.1). Provided certain data regularity, we show the error estimate for all 1

\[
\| U^n_m - u(t_n) \| \leq c(\gamma(\kappa)^m + \varepsilon^{k_1 n^{-k}}), \quad \text{with } \kappa \in (0, 1) \text{ independent of } \tau,
\]

where the positive constant \( c \) and the convergence factor \( \gamma(\kappa) \)

\[
\gamma(\kappa) = \frac{c\kappa e^{-cT}}{1 - c\kappa e^{-cT}} \in (0, 1)
\]

might depend on \( k, \kappa, \beta_0, T, v, f \), but it is independent of \( \tau, n, m \) and \( u \). Therefore, to attain the discretization error \( O(\tau^k) \) or \( O(\varepsilon^{k_1 n^{-k}}) \), the computational complexity for each processor is \( O(\log(N)|MN \log(N) + MfN|/p) \).

The above argument could be extended to the subdiffusion model, that involves a time-fractional derivative of order \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \). Let \( T > 0, v \in H, f \in L^p(0, T; V') \) with \( p \in (2/\alpha, \infty) \), and consider the
initial value problem of seeking \( u \in L^p(0, T; V) \cap H^\alpha(0, T; V') \) such that

\[
\begin{aligned}
\partial^n_t u(t) + A u(t) = f(t), & \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T], \\
u(0) = v.
\end{aligned}
\]

(1.4)

Here \( \partial^n_t u \) denotes the left-sided Caputo fractional derivative of order \( \alpha \), defined by

\[
\partial^n_\alpha u(t) := \frac{1}{\Gamma(1 - \alpha)} \int_0^t (t - s)^{-\alpha} u'(s) \, ds,
\]

(1.5)

The interest in (1.4) is motivated by its excellent capability of modeling anomalously slow diffusion, such as protein diffusion within cells, thermal diffusion in media with fractal geometry, and contaminant transport in groundwater, to name but a few. The literature on the numerical approximation for the subdiffusion equation (1.4) is vast. The most popular methods include convolution quadrature, collocation method, discontinuous Galerkin method, and spectral method for solving the parabolic problem and analyze its convergence by generating function technique. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we develop a high-order time parallel scheme for solving the parabolic problem and analyze its convergence by generating function technique. In Section 3, we extend our discussion to the nonlocal-in-time subdiffusion problem. Finally, in Section 4, we present some numerical results to illustrate and complement the theoretical analysis.

2. Parallel algorithms for normal diffusion equations. The aim of this section is to propose high-order multistep PinT schemes, with rigorous convergence analysis, for approximately solving the parabolic equation (1.4).

2.1. BDF\(k\) scheme for normal diffusion equations. We consider the BDF\(k\) scheme, \( k = 1, 2, \ldots, 6 \), with uniform step size. Let \( \{t_n = \tau n\} \) be a uniform partition of the interval \( [0, T] \), with a time step size \( \tau = T/N \). For \( n \geq 1 \), the \( k \)-step BDF scheme seeks \( U^n \in V \) such that \( \{15\} \)

\[
\begin{aligned}
\partial_\tau U^n + AU^n = f(t_n) + a_n^{(k)} (f(0) - Av) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-2} b_{\ell,n}^{(k)} \tau^\ell f(0) =: \tilde{f}_n, \\
U^{-(k-1)} = \cdots = U^{-1} = U^0 = v.
\end{aligned}
\]

(2.1)
In (2.1) we use the BDF\(k\) to approximate the first-order derivative by
\[
\partial_t U^n := \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{j=0}^{k} \omega_j U^{n-j},
\]
where constants \(\{\omega_j\}\) are coefficients of the polynomials
\[
\delta_k(\zeta) := \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} \frac{1}{\ell} (1 - \zeta)^\ell = \sum_{j=0}^{k} \omega_j \zeta^j. \tag{2.2}
\]
For \(\alpha = 1\), the BDF\(k\) scheme is known to be \(A(\vartheta_k)\)-stable with angle \(\vartheta_k = 90^\circ, 90^\circ, 86.03^\circ, 73.35^\circ, 51.84^\circ, 17.84^\circ\) for \(k = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\), respectively [29 pp. 251].

To apply the BDF\(k\) for parabolic problem, it is well-known that one need starting data \(U^j = u(t_j) + O(\tau^k)\) for \(0 \leq j \leq k - 1\). Then the error bound of the time stepping scheme is \(O(\tau^k)\). However, for nonlocal-in-time subdiffusion models (which will be discussed in section 3), the knowledge of \(\Sigma\) schemes for subdiffusion models, we decide to apply the modified formulation (2.1) of the BDF\(k\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(k)</th>
<th>(a_1^{(k)})</th>
<th>(a_2^{(k)})</th>
<th>(a_3^{(k)})</th>
<th>(a_4^{(k)})</th>
<th>(a_5^{(k)})</th>
<th>(\ell)</th>
<th>(b_1^{(k)})</th>
<th>(b_2^{(k)})</th>
<th>(b_3^{(k)})</th>
<th>(b_4^{(k)})</th>
<th>(b_5^{(k)})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{12})</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{24})</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{6})</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{8})</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{6})</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{12})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{720})</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{90})</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{240})</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{240})</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>\frac{1}{240}</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{240})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{3600})</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{360})</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{720})</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{720})</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>\frac{1}{1440}</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{1440})</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{1440})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{14400})</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{2880})</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{360})</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{720})</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{720})</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>\frac{1}{288}</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{360})</td>
<td>(-\frac{1}{720})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next lemma provides some properties of the generating function. The proof has been provided in [29] Theorem A.1, and hence omitted here.

**LEMA 2.1.** For any \(\varepsilon\), there existed \(\theta, \varepsilon \in (\pi/2, \pi)\) such that for any \(\theta \in (\pi/2, \theta, \varepsilon)\), there holds \(\delta_k(e^{-\varepsilon}) \in \Sigma_{\pi - \vartheta_k, +\pi}\) for any \(z \in \Gamma_\theta^{\pi/\sin \theta} = \{z = re^{\pm i \theta}, \ 0 \leq r \leq \pi/\sin \theta\}\), where \(\Sigma_\psi := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |\arg(z)| \leq \psi\}\). Meanwhile, there exist positive constants \(c_0\) and \(c_0'\) such that
\[
|z| \leq |\delta_k(e^{-\varepsilon})| \leq c_0|z| \quad \forall \ z \in \Gamma_\theta^{\pi/\sin \theta}.
\]

For \(n \geq k\), we choose \(a_n^{(k)}\) and \(b_{\ell,n}^{(k)}\) to be zero. Then \(\tilde{\partial}_t u(t_n)\) is the standard approximation of \(\partial_t u(t_n)\) by BDF\(k\). For \(1 \leq n \leq k - 1\), these constants have been determined in [29, 35].
the numerical solution to (2.1) satisfies the following error estimate. We omit the proof here and refer interested readers to [35, Theorem 1.1] and [29, Theorem 2.1] for error analysis of (non-selfadjoint) parabolic systems and fractional subdiffusion equations, respectively.

**Lemma 2.2.** Assume that the problem data \( v \) and \( f \) satisfy (2.3), then

\[
\|U^n - u(t_n)\| \leq c \tau^k \left( t_{n-k}^k \|v\| + \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} t_{n-k+1}^{\ell-k+1} \|\partial_t^\ell f(0)\| + \int_0^{t_n} \|\partial_t^k f(s)\| ds \right),
\]

where the constant \( c \) is independent of \( \tau \) and \( n \).

### 2.2. Development of parallel-in-time algorithm.

Next, we develop a PinT algorithm for (2.1): for given \( U_{n-1}^n, N - k + 1 \leq n \leq N \), we compute \( U^n_n \) by

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t U^n_m + AU^n_m &= \bar{f}_n, \\
U_{n-j}^m &= v + \kappa(U^{N-j}_m - U^{N-j}_{m-1}), & j = 0, 1, \ldots, k - 1,
\end{align*}
\]

(2.5)

where the revised source term \( \bar{f}_n \) is given in (2.4). Note that the exact time stepping solution \( \{U^n\}_{n=1}^N \) is a fixed point of this iteration. In Section 2.3, we provide a systematic framework to study the iterative algorithm (2.5), which also works for the time-fractional subdiffusion problem discussed later.

We may rewrite the BDFk scheme (2.5) in the following matrix form:

\[
\frac{1}{\tau}(B_k(\kappa) \otimes I_x)U_m + (I_t \otimes A)U_m = F_{m-1},
\]

(2.6)

where \( U_m = (U^1_m, U^2_m, \ldots, U^N_m)^T, F_{m-1} = (F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_N)^T \) with

\[
F_n := \bar{f}_n + \frac{\kappa}{\tau} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \omega_j U^{N-j-1}_n + \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \omega_j v,
\]

(2.7)

and

\[
B_k(\kappa) = \begin{bmatrix}
\omega_0 & \cdots & 0 & \kappa \omega_k & \cdots & \kappa \omega_2 & \kappa \omega_1 \\
\omega_1 & \omega_0 & 0 & \kappa \omega_k & \cdots & \kappa \omega_2 & \vdots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\omega_k & \omega_{k-1} & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & \kappa \omega_k & \vdots \\
0 & \omega_k & \omega_{k-1} & \cdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
& & & & & & \ddots & \omega_1 \\
& & & & & & 0 & \omega_k \\
n & & & & & & \omega_k & \omega_0
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

Here, we recall that \( \omega_j = 0 \) if \( j > k \) and \( \sum_{j=0}^{k} \omega_j = 0 \) for the normal diffusion equations. The following lemma is crucial for the design of PinT algorithm.

**Lemma 2.3** (Diagonalization). Let \( \Lambda(\kappa) = \text{diag}(1, \kappa^\frac{1}{\tau}, \ldots, \kappa^{-\frac{k+1}{\tau}}) \), then

\[
B_k(\kappa) = \Lambda(\kappa) \bar{B}_k(\kappa) \Lambda(\kappa)^{-1},
\]
where the circular matrix \( \tilde{B}_k(\kappa) \) has the form

\[
\tilde{B}_k(\kappa) = \begin{bmatrix}
\omega_0 & 0 & \kappa^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} \omega_k & \cdots & \kappa^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} \omega_2 & \kappa^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} \omega_1 \\
\kappa^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} \omega_1 & \omega_0 & 0 & \kappa^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} \omega_k & \cdots & \kappa^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} \omega_2 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\kappa^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} \omega_k & \kappa^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} \omega_{k-1} & \cdots & 0 & \kappa^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} \omega_k \\
0 & \kappa^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} \omega_k & \kappa^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} \omega_{k-1} & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \kappa^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} \omega_k & \cdots & \kappa^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} \omega_1 & \omega_0
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

As a consequence, \( B_k(\kappa) \) can be diagonalized by

\[
B_k(\kappa) = S(\kappa)D_k(\kappa)S(\kappa)^{-1}, \quad S(\kappa) := \Lambda(\kappa)V,
\]

where the Fourier matrix

\[
V = [v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_N], \quad \text{with} \quad v_n = [1, e^{\frac{2\pi i(n-1)x}{N}}, \ldots, e^{\frac{2\pi i(n-1)(N-1)x}{N}}]^T,
\]

and \( D_k(\kappa) \) is a diagonal matrix.

Using the above lemma, we can solve the system \( \tilde{B}_k(\kappa)U = \tilde{F} \) in a parallel-in-time manner.

**Algorithm 1** PinT algorithm by diagonalization technique for diffusion equation.

1. Solve \((S(\kappa) \otimes I_x)H = F_{m-1}\).
2. Solve \((D_k(\kappa) \otimes I_x + \tau I \otimes A)Q = \tau H\).
3. Solve \((S(\kappa)^{-1} \otimes I_x)U_m = Q\).

It is known that the circulant matrix can be diagonalized by FFT with \( O(N \log N) \) operations \cite{20}. Chapter 4.7.7. Then in each iteration, it turns out to be \( N \) independent Poisson-like equations, which can be efficiently solved by, for instance, the multigrid method.

*Speedup analysis of Algorithm 1* Let \( M_f \) be the total real floating point operations for solving the (elliptic) Poisson-like equations. Then the cost for the serial computation is \( O(M_fN) \). It is known that with (optimal) multigrid method \( M_f \) is proportional to \( M \), the number of degrees of freedom in space.

Consider the parallelization of Algorithm 1 with \( p \) processors. The Step 1 and Step 3 can be finished with the total computational cost \( O([MN \log(N)]/p) \) by using the bulk synchronous parallel FFT algorithm \cite{20}, see also \cite{16} Section 4.1 for the detailed analysis. We note here that the \( F \) in \( \tilde{F} \) needs to be updated via \( U_{m-1} \), whose computational cost is \( O(M) \) since \( \omega_j = 0 \) when \( j > k \). The PinT algorithm of \( F \) will be more delicate for the time-fractional subdiffusion problem discussed later.

For the Step 2, the total computational cost is \( O((\tilde{M}_fN)/p) \), where \( \tilde{M}_f \) denotes total real floating point operations for solving the Poisson-like equations obtained by diagonalization, and hence the cost for the parallel computation is \( O([MN \log(N) + \tilde{M}_fN]/p) \). In case that \( p = O(N) \), then the parallel computational cost reduces to \( O(M \log(N) + \tilde{M}_f) \). In some cases, \( \tilde{M}_f \) could be (almost) linear to \( M \) even in higher dimensions. For example, if we consider the heat equation with periodic boundary conditions, we can apply FFT to solve the Poisson-like equations with computational complexity \( \tilde{M}_f = O(M \log M) \).

With \( \varepsilon \) being the desired error tolerance, a \( k \)-th order time stepping scheme requires \( N = O(\varepsilon^{-1/k}) \) time steps. Then, in order to obtain sufficient accuracy \( O(\varepsilon) \), the number of iterations should be \( O(\log N) \), because the convergence factor \( \gamma(\kappa) \in (0, 1) \) is independent of \( N \) (cf. Theorem 2.7). Therefore, the total computational cost is \( O([MN \log(N)^2 + \tilde{M}_fN \log N]/p) \).

**Remark 2.1.** The proposed algorithm uses FFT to diagonalize over time. It transforms the parabolic

PDE into a decoupled set of elliptic PDEs. Such a technique is quite common for solving time-periodic problems, but relatively new for solving initial value problems.

In this paper, we only discuss the parallelism in the time direction. Nevertheless, combining the proposed method with some parallel-in-space algorithms, one may obtain an algorithm with polylog parallel complexity if \( O(MN) \) processors were available. For example, for parabolic equations with periodic boundary conditions, one may apply FFT to transform the parabolic PDE into a decoupled set of ODEs:

\[
u_j'(t) + \lambda_j u_j(t) = f_j(t), \quad \text{with} \quad u_j(0) = v_j,
\]

where \( 1 \leq j \leq M \) and \( M \) denotes the number of degree of freedoms in space. Then, these decoupled ODEs could be efficiently solved by using the parallel-in-time algorithm proposed in this paper.

**Roundoff error of Algorithm** \( \text{Algorithm 1} \) Let \( U_m \) be the exact solution of (2.6), and \( \hat{U}_m \) be the solution of Algorithm \( \text{Algorithm 1} \). We assume that the **Step 2** of Algorithm \( \text{Algorithm 1} \) is solved in a direct manner (for example, the LU factorization). Then for simplicity, we consider an arbitrary eigenvalue of the matrix \( A \) and analyze the relative roundoff error. To this end, we replace matrices \( I_2 \) and \( A \) by scalars \( 1 \) and \( \mu \). Then the system (2.6) reduces to

\[
BU_m = F, \quad \text{with} \quad B = \frac{1}{\tau}B_k(\kappa) + \mu I_1.
\]

Then by Lemma 2.3, we define

\[
D = S(\kappa)^{-1}BS(\kappa), \quad \text{and hence} \quad D = \frac{1}{\tau}D_k(\kappa) + \mu I_1.
\]

Note that to solve \( BU_m = F \) by diagonalization is equivalent to solving \( (B + \delta B)\hat{U}_m = F \) with some perturbation \( \delta B \), which can be easily bounded by [10, p. 496]

\[
\|\delta B\|_2 \leq \epsilon(2N + 1)\|S(\kappa)\|_2\|S(\kappa)^{-1}\|_2D\|_2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2),
\]

where \( \epsilon \) denotes the machine precision (\( \epsilon = 2.2204 \times 10^{-16} \) for a 32-bit computer). Then the roundoff error satisfies

\[
\frac{\|U_m - \hat{U}_m\|_2}{\|U_m\|_2} \leq \text{cond}_2(B)\|\delta B\|_2 \leq \epsilon(2N + 1)\|S(\kappa)\|_2\|S(\kappa)^{-1}\|_2D\|_2\|B^{-1}\|_2
\]

\[
\leq \epsilon(2N + 1)\text{cond}_2(S(\kappa))^2\text{cond}_2(D).
\]

Here we note that for \( \kappa \in (0, 1] \)

\[
\|S(\kappa)\|_2 \leq \|\Lambda(\kappa)\|_2V_2 \leq \kappa^{-\frac{\mu\tau}{\sqrt{N}}},
\]

and

\[
\|S(\kappa)^{-1}\|_2 \leq \|\Lambda(\kappa)^{-1}\|_2V^{-1}_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}.
\]

Therefore, we arrive at

\[
\text{cond}_2(S(\kappa)) = \|S(\kappa)\|_2\|S(\kappa)^{-1}\|_2 \leq \kappa^{-\frac{\mu\tau}{\sqrt{N}}} \leq \kappa^{-1}.
\]

For the diagonal matrix \( D \)

\[
\|D^{-1}\|_2 = \max_{1 \leq n \leq N} \left| \frac{1}{\tau} \delta_k(\kappa^\frac{\tau}{\sqrt{\kappa}} e^{-\frac{2(n-1)i\pi}{N}} + \mu)^{-1} \right| \leq (\sin \theta_k \mu)^{-1}.
\]

Here we apply \( A(\theta_k) \) stability of the BDF\( k \) scheme with \( \theta_k \in (0, \pi/2) \). Similarly, using the definition of generating function (2.22), we derive for any \( \kappa \in (0, 1) \) and \( N > 1 \)

\[
\|D\|_2 = \max_{1 \leq n \leq N} \left| \frac{1}{\tau} \delta_k(\kappa^\frac{\tau}{\sqrt{\kappa}} e^{-\frac{2(n-1)i\pi}{N}} + \mu) \right| \leq \frac{1}{\tau} \delta_k(-\kappa^\frac{\tau}{\sqrt{\kappa}} + \mu) \leq \frac{1}{\tau} \delta_k(-\kappa^\frac{\tau}{\sqrt{\kappa}}) + \mu.
\]
Hence, we obtain
\[ \cond_2(D) \leq (\delta_k(-1)/\tau + \mu)(\mu \sin \theta_k)^{-1}. \]
As a result, we have for \( \mu \in [\mu_0, \infty) \) (where the positive number \( \mu_0 \) depends on \( \beta_0 \) in (1.2))
\[ \frac{\|U_m - \bar{U}_m\|}{\|U_m\|} \leq C_k\epsilon^{-2}(\delta_k(-1)/\tau + \mu)(\mu \sin \theta_k)^{-1} \leq C_k\epsilon^{-2}N^2, \]
where the constant \( C_k \) can be written as
\[ C_k = 3\left(1 + \left[\delta_k(-1)/\tau\right]/\mu_0\right)(\sin \theta_k)^{-1}. \]
It only depends on the order of BDF method and \( \beta_0 \) in (1.2). Note that the bound of roundoff error is uniform for \( \mu \to \infty \), therefore it holds for all self-adjoint operators \( A \) satisfying (1.2).

**Remark 2.2.** The above analysis shows a reasonable estimate that roundoff error is \( O(\epsilon^{-2}N^2) \). See a similar estimates for some A-stable single-step methods like backward Euler scheme or Crank–Nicolson scheme [10]. The difference is that the BDFk scheme (with \( k > 2 \)) is no longer A-stable. In our numerical experiments, we indeed observe that the roundoff error increases as \( N \to \infty \).

**2.3. Representation of numerical solution.** The aim of this section is to develop the representation of the numerical solution of the \( k \)-step BDF schemes through a contour integral in complex domain, and to establish decaying properties of the solution operators.

By letting \( W^n = U^n - v \), we can reformulate the time stepping scheme (2.1) as
\[ \partial_t W^n + AW^n = -Av + f_n, \quad n = 1, 2, \cdots, N, \quad W^{-(k-1)} = \cdots = W^{-1} = W^0 = 0. \]
By multiplying \( \xi^n \) on (2.11) and taking summation over \( n \) (we extend \( n \) in (2.11) to infinity in sense that \( f_n = 0 \) with \( n \geq N \)), we have
\[ \sum_{n=1}^\infty \xi^n \partial_t W^n + \sum_{n=1}^\infty \xi^n AW^n = -\sum_{n=1}^\infty \xi^n Av + \tilde{f}_n \xi^n. \]
For any given sequence \( \{V^n\}_{n=0}^\infty \), let \( \tilde{V}(\xi) := \sum_{n=0}^\infty V^n \xi^n \) denote its generating function. Since \( W^{-(k-1)} = \cdots = W^{-1} = W^0 = 0 \), according to properties of discrete convolution, we have the identity
\[ \sum_{n=1}^\infty \xi^n \partial_t V_n = \frac{\delta_k(\xi)}{\tau} \tilde{V}(\xi), \]
where \( \delta_k(\xi) \) denotes the generating function of the \( k \)-step BDF method (2.2). Therefore we conclude that
\[ \left( \frac{\delta_k(\xi)}{\tau} + A \right) \tilde{W}(\xi) = -\left( \frac{\xi}{1 - \xi} \right) Av + \tilde{f}_n(\xi), \]
which implies that
\[ \tilde{W}(\xi) = \left( \frac{\delta_k(\xi)}{\tau} + A \right)^{-1} \left[ -\left( \frac{\xi}{1 - \xi} \right) Av + \tilde{f}_n(\xi) \right]. \]
It is easy to see that \( \tilde{W}(\xi) \) is analytic with respect to \( \xi \) in the circle \( |\xi| = \rho \), for \( \rho > 0 \) small, on the complex plane, then with Cauchy’s integral formula, we have the following expression
\[ W^n = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|\xi| = \rho} \xi^{-n-1} \tilde{W}(\xi) d\xi \]
\[ = \frac{\tau}{2\pi i} \int_{|\xi| = \rho} \xi^{-n-1} \left( \delta_k(\xi) + \tau A \right)^{-1} \left[ -\left( \frac{\xi}{1 - \xi} \right) Av + \tilde{f}_n(\xi) \right] d\xi. \]
Therefore we obtain the solution representation:

\[ U^n = (I + F^n)v + \tau \sum_{j=1}^{n} E^{n-j}_\tau \bar{f}_j, \]  

where the discrete operators \( F^n \) and \( E^n_\tau \) are respectively defined by

\[
F^n = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|\xi| = \rho} \frac{1}{\xi^n (1 - \xi)} \left( \frac{\delta_k(\xi)}{\tau A} + A \right) \ d\xi,
\]

\[
E^n_\tau = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|\xi| = \rho} \xi^{-n-1} \left( \frac{\delta_k(\xi)}{\tau A} + A \right)^{-1} \ d\xi.
\]  

Now we recall a useful estimate (cf. [55, Lemma 10.3]). For \( k = 1, \ldots, 6 \), there are positive constants \( c, C \) and \( \lambda_0 \) (only depends on the BDFk method) such that

\[
\left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|\xi| = \rho} \xi^{-n-1} (\delta_k(\xi) + \lambda)^{-1} \ d\xi \right| \leq \begin{cases}
C e^{-c n \lambda}, & 0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_0, \\
C A^{-1} e^{-c n \lambda_0}, & \lambda > \lambda_0.
\end{cases}
\]  

2.4. Convergence analysis. In this section, we analyze the convergence of the iterative scheme (2.14), or equivalently,

\[
\bar{\partial}_\tau U^n_m + A U^n_m = \bar{f}_n - \frac{\kappa}{\tau} G^n_m, \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots, N,
\]

\[
U^{-j}_m = v, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, k - 1.
\]  

where the term \( G^n_m \) is given by

\[
G^n_m = \sum_{j=n}^{k} \omega_j \left( U^{N+n-j}_m - U^{N+n-j-1}_m \right).
\]  

Here, the summation is assumed to vanish if the lower bound is greater than the upper bound. We aim to show that \( U^n_m \) converges to \( U^N \), the solution of the time stepping scheme (2.11), as \( m \to \infty \).

Lemma 2.5. Let \( U^n_m \) be the solution to the iterative scheme (2.14) with \( v = 0 \) and \( \bar{f}_n = 0 \) for all \( n = 1, 2, \ldots, N \). Then we can choose a proper parameter \( \kappa > 0 \) in (2.15), which is independent of step size \( \tau \), such that the following estimate holds valid:

\[
\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \| U^{N-j}_m \| \leq \gamma(\kappa) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \| U^{N-j}_m \|.
\]

Here \( \gamma(\kappa) \in (0, 1) \), is constant depending on \( \kappa, \beta_0 \) and \( T \), but independent of \( \tau \).

Proof. Following the preceding argument in Section 2.3, \( U^n_m \) could be represented by

\[
U^n_m = -\kappa \sum_{i=1}^{\min\{k, n\}} E^{n-i}_\tau G^i_m
\]

\[
= -\kappa \sum_{i=1}^{\min\{k, n\}} E^{n-i}_\tau \sum_{j=i}^{k} \omega_j (U^{N+i-j}_m - U^{N+i-j-1}_m), \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots, N.
\]
Now we take the $H$ norm in (2.17) and apply Lemma 2.4 to obtain
\[
\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|U_m^{N-j}\| \leq cke^{-c_1 T} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|U_m^{N-j} - U_{m-1}^{N-j}\|,
\]
where $c$ is a generic constant and $c_1$ is the constant in Lemma 2.4. Then we apply the triangle inequality, by choosing $\kappa$ small enough such that $cke^{-c_1 T} < 1$, and hence derive that
\[
\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|U_m^{N-j}\| \leq \frac{cke^{-c_1 T}}{1 - cke^{-c_1 T}} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|U_{m-1}^{N-j}\|.
\]
Finally, we define the convergence factor
\[
\gamma(\kappa) := \frac{cke^{-c_1 T}}{1 - cke^{-c_1 T}}.
\]
Then by choose $\kappa$ sufficiently small such that $cke^{-c_1 T} \in (0, 1/2)$, we have $\gamma(\kappa) \in (0, 1)$. This completes the proof of the desired assertion.

**Corollary 2.6.** Let $U_m^n$ be the solution to the iterative scheme (2.5), and $U^n$ be the solution to the $k$-step BDF scheme (2.1). Then we can choose a proper parameter $\kappa > 0$ in (2.4), which is independent of step size $\tau$, such that the following estimate holds valid:
\[
\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|U_{m-j}^N - U_{m-j}^m\| \leq \gamma(\kappa) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|U_{m-j}^N - U_{m-j}^{m-1}\|, \quad \forall \ m \geq 1.
\]
Here $\gamma(\kappa) \in (0, 1)$, is constant depending on $\kappa$, $\beta_0$ and $T$, but independent of $\tau$.

**Proof.** To this end, we let $e_m^n = (U_m^n - U^n)$, and note that the time stepping solution $\{U^n\}_{n=1}^N$ is the fixed point of the iteration (2.5). Therefore $e_m^n$ satisfies
\[
\partial_t e_m^n + A e_m^n = -\kappa K_m^n, \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots, N,
\]
\[
e_m^n = 0, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, k - 1.
\]
where the term $K_m^n$ is given by
\[
K_m^n = \sum_{j=n}^{k} \omega_j (e_m^{n+j} - e_m^{n+j-1}).
\]
Then the convergence estimate follows immediately from Theorem 2.7.

Combining Corollary 2.6 with the estimate (2.4), we have the following error estimate of the iterative scheme (2.5).

**Theorem 2.7.** Suppose that the assumptions (1.2) and (2.3) are valid. Let $U_m^n$ be the solution to the iterative scheme (2.5) with the initial guess $U_0^n = v$ for all $0 \leq n \leq N$, and $u$ be the exact solution to the parabolic equation (1.1). Then by choosing proper relaxation parameter $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ which is independent of step size $\tau$, the following estimate holds valid:
\[
\|U_m^n - u(t_n)\| \leq c(\gamma(\kappa)^n + \theta^{n-k}), \quad \text{for all } n = 1, 2, \ldots, N.
\]
Here constants $\gamma(\kappa) \in (0, 1)$ and $c > 0$ might depend on $k$, $\kappa$, $\beta_0$, $T$, $v$ and $f$, but they are independent of $m$, $n$, $\tau$ and $u$.

**Proof.** We split the error into two parts:
\[
U_m^n - u(t_n) = (U_m^n - U^n) + (U^n - u(t_n)),
\]
where $U^n$ is the solution to the $k$-step BDF scheme (2.1). Note that the second term has the error bound
Meanwhile, via (2.6), we have the estimate
\[ k - 1 \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|U^N - j - U^N_m\| \leq \gamma(\kappa)^m \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|U^N - j - v\| \leq \gamma(\kappa)^m \|v\| + \gamma(\kappa)^m \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|U^N - j\| \]

By the error estimate (2.4) and the assumption of data regularity (2.3), we obtain that
\[ k - 1 \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|U^N - j\| \leq cT. \]

This, (2.17) and Lemma 2.4 lead to the estimate that
\[ \|U^n - U^n_m\| \leq c\gamma(\kappa) \left( \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|U^N - j - U^N_m\| + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|U^N - j - U^N_m\| \right) \leq c\gamma(\kappa)^m. \]

Then we obtain the desired result.

**Remark 2.3.** For backward Euler method (BDF1), the convergence rate was proved to be [16]
\[ \gamma(\kappa) = \frac{\kappa e^{-c_1 T}}{1 - \kappa e^{-c_1 T}} < \frac{\kappa}{1 - \kappa}, \]

So the iterative algorithm converges linearly by choosing \( \kappa < 1/2 \), and the smaller parameter \( \kappa \) leads to the faster convergence. However, in Section 2.2, we have shown that the roundoff error is proportional to \( O(\kappa^{-2}) \), so a tiny \( \kappa \) may lead to a disastrous roundoff error. Therefore one needs to choose a proper \( \kappa \in (0,1/2) \) in order to balance the roundoff error and the convergence rate.

For \( k \)-step BDF methods with \( 1 < k \leq 6 \), we obtain a similar result
\[ \gamma(\kappa) = \frac{c_1^k e^{-c_1 T}}{1 - c_1^k e^{-c_1 T}} \leq \frac{ck}{1 - c_1^k}, \]

with an extra factor \( c > 1 \). This is due to the different stability estimate in Lemma 2.4 of linear multistep methods. Even though it is hard to derive an explicit bound of the generic constant \( c \) for \( k \)-step BDF methods, our empirical experiments show that the choice \( \kappa \approx 0.1 \) leads to an acceptable roundoff error (\( \approx 10^{-12} \)), and meanwhile the convergence is very fast (see Fig. 4.1b). Note that the convergence rate is independent of \( N \), so the increase in the total number of steps will not affect the robust convergence.

3. Parallel algorithms for nonlocal-in-time subdiffusion equations. In the section, we shall consider the subdiffusion equations (1.4), which involve a fractional-in-time derivative of order \( \alpha \in (0,1) \). The fractional-order differential operator is nonlocal, and its discretization inherits this nonlocality and looks like a multistep discretization with an infinitely wide stencil. This motivates us to extend the argument established in Section 2 to the subdiffusion equations (1.4).

3.1. BDF\( k \) scheme for subdiffusion equations. To begin with, we discuss the development of a PinT algorithm for (1.4). We apply the convolution quadrature (CQ) to discretize the fractional derivative on uniform grids. Following the same setting in Section 2.2, let \( \{t_n = n\tau\}_{n=0}^{N} \) be a uniform partition of the time interval \([0,T]\), with a time step size \( \tau = T/N \).

CQ was first proposed by Lubich [38, 39] for discretizing Volterra integral equations. This approach provides a systematic framework to construct high-order numerical methods to discretize fractional derivatives, and has been the foundation of many early works. Specifically, CQ approximates the Riemann-Liouville derivative \( \mathcal{R}_t^\alpha \varphi(t_n) \) with \( \alpha \in (0,1) \), which is defined by
\[ \mathcal{R}_t^\alpha \varphi := \frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{\Gamma(1 - \alpha)} \int_0^t (t - s)^{-\alpha} \varphi(s) \, ds, \]
(with \( \varphi(0) = 0 \)) by a discrete convolution (with the shorthand notation \( \varphi^n = \varphi(t_n) \))

\[
\hat{\partial}_t^{\alpha} \varphi^n := \frac{1}{\tau^\alpha} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \omega_j^{(\alpha)} \varphi^{n-j}.
\]  

(3.1)

Here we consider the BDF\(k\) method for example, then the weights \( \{\omega_j^{(\alpha)}\}_{j=0}^\infty \) are the coefficients in the power series expansion

\[
\delta_k(\xi)^\alpha = \sum_{j=0}^\infty \omega_j^{(\alpha)} \xi^j,
\]  

(3.2)

where \( \delta_k(\xi) \) is given by (2.2). Generally, the weights \( \{\omega_j^{(\alpha)}\}_{j=0}^\infty \) can be computed either by the fast Fourier transform or recursion (3.2).

The next lemma provides a useful bound of the coefficients \( \omega_j^{(\alpha)} \).

**Lemma 3.1.** The weights \( \omega_n^{(\alpha)} \) satisfy the estimate that \( |\omega_n^{(\alpha)}| \leq c(n+1)^{-\alpha-1} \), where the constant \( c \) only depends on \( \alpha \) and \( k \).

**Proof.** The case of \( k = 1 \) has been proved in [31] Lemma 12, by using the expression of the coefficients: \( \omega_n^{(\alpha)} = -\prod_{j=1}^{n}(1-\frac{1+\alpha}{j}) \). However, the closed forms of coefficients of high-order schemes are not available. Here we provide a systematic proof for all BDF\(k\) methods, \( k = 1, 2, \ldots, 6 \).

By the definition of \( \{\omega_j^{(\alpha)}\} \) and Cauchy’s integral formula, we obtain that

\[
\omega_j^{(\alpha)} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|\xi| = 1} \delta_k(\xi)^\alpha \xi^{-n-1} \, d\xi = \frac{\tau^{1+\alpha}}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma^r} e^{zt_n}(\delta_k(e^{-zr})/\tau)^\alpha \, dz,
\]

where \( \Gamma^r := \{z = iy : y \in \mathbb{R}, |y| \leq \pi/\tau\} \). The analyticity together with the periodicity of the integrand allows the deformation of the contour to

\[
\Gamma^r = \{z = re^{\pm i\psi} : 0 \leq r \leq \pi/\tau \sin \psi\},
\]

with \( \psi \in (\pi/2, \pi) \). Then Lemma 2.1 implies for \( n \geq 1 \)

\[
|\omega_j^{(\alpha)}| \leq cr^{1+\alpha} \int_{\Gamma^r} |e^{zt_n}| |\delta_k(e^{-zr})|^\alpha |dz| \leq cr^{1+\alpha} \int_0^{\tau_n} e^{rt_n \cos \psi r \alpha} \, dr \\
\leq cr^{1+\alpha} t_n \alpha - 1 \leq cn \alpha - 1 \leq 4c(n+1)^{-\alpha - 1}.
\]

This together with the uniform bound of \( \omega_0^{(\alpha)} \) leads to the desired result. \( \square \)

Using the relation \( \partial_t^{\alpha} \varphi(t) = R^{\alpha} \partial_x^{\alpha} (\varphi - \varphi(0)) \), see e.g. [31] p. 91, the subdiffusion problem could be rewritten into the form

\[
R^{\alpha} \partial_x^{\alpha} (u - v) + Au = f.
\]

Then the time stepping scheme based on the CQ for problem (1.4) is to seek approximations \( U^n \) to the exact solution \( u(t_n) \) by

\[
\hat{\partial}_t^{\alpha} (U^n - v) + AU^n = f(t_n), \quad n = 1, \ldots, N.
\]  

(3.3)

By the definition of the discretized operator \( \hat{\partial}_t^{\alpha} \) in (3.1), we have

\[
\hat{\partial}_t^{\alpha} (U^n - v) = \frac{1}{\tau^\alpha} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \omega_j^{(\alpha)} (U^{n-j} - v) = \frac{1}{\tau^\alpha} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \omega_j^{(\alpha)} U^{n-j} =: \bar{\partial}_t^{\alpha} U^n,
\]  

(3.4)

by setting the historical initial data

\[
U^n = v, \quad \text{for all } n \leq 0.
\]  

(3.5)
Then we reformulate the time stepping scheme \((3.3)-(3.5)\) by
\[
\ddot{U}^n + A U^n = f(t_n), \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots, N, \\
U^n = v, \quad n \leq 0.
\] (3.6)

If the exact solution \(u\) is smooth and has sufficiently many vanishing derivatives at \(t = 0\), then the approximation \(U^n\) converges at a rate of \(O(\tau^k)\) uniformly in time \(t\) \([39, \text{Theorem 3.1}]\). However, it generally only exhibits a first-order accuracy when solving fractional evolution equations even for smooth \(v\) and \(f\) \([8, 29]\), because the requisite compatibility conditions
\[Av + f(0) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \partial^\ell f(0) = 0 \quad \forall \ell = 1, 2, \ldots, k,\]
are usually not satisfied. This loss of accuracy is one distinct feature for most time stepping schemes deriving under the assumption that the solution \(u\) is sufficiently smooth.

In order to restore the high-order convergence rate, we simply modify the starting steps \([8, 29, 41, 62]\). In particular, for \(n \geq 1\), the CQ-BDFk scheme seeks \(U^n \in V\) such that
\[
\ddot{U}^n + A U^n = f(t_n) + a_n^{(k)}(f(0) - Av) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-2} b_{\ell,n}^{(k)} \tau^\ell \partial^\ell f(0) =: \bar{f}_n,
\] (3.7)
\[
U^n = v, \quad n \leq 0.
\]

The coefficients \(a_n^{(k)}\) and \(b_{\ell,n}^{(k)}\) have to be chosen appropriately (cf. Table 2.1). For \(n \geq k\), \(a_n^{(k)}\) and \(b_{\ell,n}^{(k)}\) are zero, then \(\ddot{U}^n u(t_n)\) is the standard CQ-BDFk scheme, that approximates \(\partial^k_t u(t_n)\). Then there holds the following error estimate \([29, \text{Theorem 2.1}]\).

**Lemma 3.2.** If the initial data \(v\) and forcing data \(f\) satisfy
\[
v \in H \quad \text{and} \quad f \in W^{k, \frac{1}{\alpha}, \tau}(0, T; H) \quad \text{with some} \quad \epsilon > 0,
\] (3.8)
then the time stepping solution \(U^n\) to (3.7) satisfies the following error estimate:
\[
\|U^n - u(t_n)\| \leq c \tau^k \left( t_n^{-k} \|v\| + \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} t_n^{-\alpha+\ell-k} \|\partial^\ell f(0)\| + \int_0^{t_n} (t-s)^{\alpha-1} \|\partial^k f(s)\| ds \right),
\] (3.9)
where the constant \(c\) is independent of \(\tau\) and \(t_n\).

**3.2. Development of parallel-in-time scheme.** In order to develop a parallel solver for the time stepping method (3.7), we apply the strategy developed in Section 2.4. For given \(U_{m-1}^n, \leq n \leq N\), we compute \(U_m^n\) by
\[
\ddot{U}^n_m + A U^n_m = \bar{f}_n, \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots, N, \quad U_m^N = v + \kappa(U_m^{N-n} - U_m^{N-1}), \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots, N - 1, \quad U_m^0 = v, \quad n \leq -N.
\] (3.10)

where the revised source term \(\bar{f}_n\) is given in \((3.7)\). Note that \(\{U_m^n\}_{n=1}^N\), the exact time stepping solution to \((3.7)\), is a fixed point of this iteration. We shall examine convergence in Section 3.3.

Now we may rewrite the perturbed BDFk scheme \((3.10)\) in the following matrix form:
\[
\frac{1}{\tau^\omega}(B_k(\kappa) \otimes I_x) U_m + (I_t \otimes A) U_m = F_{m-1},
\] (3.11)
where \(U_m = (U_m^1, U_m^2, \ldots, U_m^N)^T\), \(F_{m-1} = (F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_N)^T\) with
\[
F_n = \bar{f}_n + \frac{\kappa}{\tau^\omega} \sum_{j=n}^{N-1} \omega_j U_m^{N-n-j} + \frac{1}{\tau^\omega} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \omega_j v,
\] (3.12)
and

\[ B_k(\kappa) = \begin{bmatrix} \omega_0 & \kappa \omega_{N-1} & \cdots & \kappa \omega_2 & \kappa \omega_1 \\ \omega_1 & \omega_0 & \cdots & \kappa \omega_3 & \kappa \omega_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \omega_{N-1} & \omega_{N-2} & \cdots & \omega_0 & \kappa \omega_{N-1} \end{bmatrix}. \]

Similar as Lemma 2.3, we have the following result.

**Lemma 3.3 (Diagonalization).** Let \( \Lambda(\kappa) = \text{diag}(1, \kappa, \kappa^2, \cdots, \kappa^{\frac{N-1}{N}}) \), then

\[ B_k(\kappa) = S(\kappa)D_k(\kappa)S(\kappa)^{-1}, \quad S(\kappa) = \Lambda(\kappa)V, \]

where \( V \) is the Fourier matrix defined in (2.8).

The above lemma implies the parallel solver for (3.10).

**Algorithm 2** PinT BDF \( k \) scheme for subdiffusion.

1. Solve \((S(\kappa) \otimes I_x)H = F_{m-1}\).
2. Solve \((D_k(\kappa) \otimes I_x + \tau^\alpha I_t \otimes A)Q = \tau^\alpha H\).
3. Solve \((S(\kappa)^{-1} \otimes I_x)U_m = Q\).

**Speedup analysis of Algorithm 2.** Due to the nonlocality of the fractional-order differential operator, the discretized operator (3.4) requires the information of all the previous steps. In particular, in the \( n \)-th step of CQ-BDF \( k \) scheme, we need to solve a poisson-like problem:

\[ (\omega_0^{(\alpha)}I + \tau^\alpha A)U^n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \omega_j^{(\alpha)}(U^{n-j}) + \omega_0^{(\alpha)}U^0 + f^n. \]

The computation cost of this step is \( O(nM + Mf) \). Then taking summation over \( n \) from 1 to \( N \), we derive that the total computational cost of the direct implementation of CQ-BDF \( k \) scheme is \( O(MN^2 + MfN) \).

Consider the parallelization of Algorithm 2 with \( p \) used processors. Similar to the discussion on Algorithm 1 the cost of parallel FFT in Step 1 and Step 3 is \( O([MN \log(N)]/p) \). We check the computation cost of \( F_{m-1} \) in Step 1, which contains the following three components: [3.12].

1. The source term \( f^n \) defined in (3.7): The correction is taken at first few steps and hence the computation cost is \( O([MN]/p) \).
2. The convolution term \( \sum_{j=n}^{N-1} \omega_j U_{m-1}^{n+j} \) can be rewritten as the \( n \)-th entry of

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\omega_N & \omega_{N-1} & \cdots & \omega_2 & \omega_1 \\
0 & \omega_N & \cdots & \omega_3 & \omega_2 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & \omega_N & \omega_{N-1} \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \omega_N \\
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
U_{m-1}^1 \\
U_{m-1}^2 \\
\vdots \\
U_{m-1}^{N-1} \\
U_{m-1}^N \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[ := WU_{m-1}. \]

Although \( W \) is not circulant, the above matrix can be extended to be circulant for the purpose of using FFT algorithm. More precisely, consider

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
Z & W \\
W & Z \\
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
U_{m-1} \\
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{with} \quad Z :=
\begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\
\omega_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\omega_{N-2} & \omega_{N-3} & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\
\omega_{N-1} & \omega_{N-2} & \cdots & \omega_1 & 0 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]
It can be easily seen that the extended matrix is circulant. Thanks again to the bulk synchronous parallel FFT algorithm \cite{26}, the FFT of the extended system and $[0, U_{m-1}]^T$ lead to the computation costs $O([N \log(N)]/p)$ and $O([MN \log(N)]/p)$, respectively. By using the inverse FFT, the computation cost of the convolution term $\sum_{j=n}^{N-1} \omega_j U_{m-1}^{N+j}$ turns out to be $O([MN \log(N)]/p)$.

3. The convolution term $\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \omega_j v$ can be computed with the cost $O([N \log(N) + MN]/p)$.

For the Step 2, the total computational cost is $O([MN/N]/p)$. To sum up, the overall cost for the parallel computation is $O([MN \log(N) + MN]/p)$, which becomes $O(M \log N + MN)$ if $p = O(N)$.

Similar to the discussion on Algorithm 1, in order to attain desired accuracy, the total computational cost is $O([MN \log(N)]^2 + MN \log(N))/p$ for each processor.

**Roundoff error of Algorithm 1**. In case that $I_x = 1$ and $A = \mu$, by using the same argument in Section 3.2, the roundoff error can be bounded by

$$
\|U_m - \tilde{U}_m\|_2 \leq \varepsilon(2N + 1)\kappa^{-2} \left(\left[\frac{\delta_k(-1)}{\tau}\right]^\alpha + \mu\right)(\mu \sin(\alpha(\pi - \theta_k), \pi/2))^{-1}.
$$

For $\mu \in [\mu_0, \infty)$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we have the uniform estimate

$$
\|U_m - \tilde{U}_m\|_2 \leq \varepsilon(2N + 1)\kappa^{-2} \left(1 + \left[\frac{\delta_k(-1)}{\tau}\right]^\alpha / \mu_0\right)(\sin(\alpha(\pi - \theta_k), \pi/2))^{-1} \leq C_k \varepsilon^2 N^{1+\alpha},
$$

where the constant $C_k$ is

$$
C_k = 3 \left(1 + \left[\frac{\delta_k(-1)}{T}\right]^\alpha / \mu_0\right)(\sin(\alpha(\pi - \theta_k), \pi/2))^{-1}.
$$

Note that the constant $C_k$ depends on the order of BDF method, $\beta_0$ in (1.2), the terminal time $T$ and the fractional order $\alpha$.

**3.3. Representation of numerical solution and convergence analysis.** Next, we represent the solution of the time stepping scheme (3.17) as a contour integral in complex domain. Following the argument in Section 3.3, the solution to the time stepping scheme (3.17) can be written as

$$
U^n = (I + F^n) v + \tau \sum_{j=1}^n E^{n-j} \tilde{f}_j,
$$

where the discrete operators $F^n$ and $E^n$ are respectively defined by

$$
F^n = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|\xi|=\rho} \frac{1}{\xi^n (1 - \xi)} \left((\delta_k(\xi)/\tau)^\alpha + A\right)^{-1} A d\xi,
$$

$$
E^n = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|\xi|=\rho} \xi^{-n-1} \left((\delta_k(\xi)/\tau)^\alpha + A\right)^{-1} d\xi.
$$

The following lemma provides the decay properties of the discrete solution operator. The proof is standard, see, for example, \cite{11, 29}, and hence it is omitted.

**Lemma 3.4.** For the solution operators $E^n$ defined by (3.17), there holds that

$$
\|E^n\|_{H - H} \leq c\tau^{n-1}, \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots, N.
$$

where the constant $c$ is independent of $\tau$ and $n$.

In this section, we aim to show the convergence of the iterative method (3.10) by choosing an appro-
priate parameter \( \kappa \). Equivalently, the scheme \((2.5)\) could be reformulated as
\[
\partial_t^2 U_m^n + AU_m^n = f_n - \frac{\kappa}{\tau^2} G_m^n, \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots, N,
\]
where \( U_m^N = v, \quad n \leq 0. \)

We aim to show that \( U_m^N \) converges to \( U^N \), the solution of COQ-BDFk scheme \((3.7)\), as \( m \to \infty \).

**Lemma 3.5.** Let \( U_m^n \) be the solution to the iterative algorithm \((3.10)\) with \( v = 0 \) and \( f_n = 0 \) for all \( n = 1, 2, \ldots, N \). Then we can choose a proper parameter \( \kappa = O(1/\log(N)) \) in \((2.5)\), such that the following estimate holds valid:
\[
\| U_m^n \| \leq c n^{-1} (\kappa(n))^{\alpha} \sum_j t_j^{-1} \| U_0^{N-j+1} \|^\alpha.
\]

Here \( \kappa(n) \in (0, 1) \) might depend on \( \alpha, \kappa, \beta_0 \) and \( T \), but independent of \( \tau, n \) and \( m \).

**Proof.** By the equivalent formula \((3.10)\) and the expression \((3.14)\), we have
\[
U_m^n = -\kappa \tau^{1-\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^n t_i^{1-\alpha} G_m^n = -\kappa \tau^{1-\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^n t_i^{1-\alpha} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \omega_\alpha^{(j)} \langle U_m^{N-j} - U_m^{N-j} \rangle.
\]

Now we take the \( H \) norm in the above equality and apply Lemma 3.4 to obtain that
\[
\| U_m^n \| \leq c \kappa \tau^{1-\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^n (n-i+1)^{\alpha-1} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \omega_\alpha^{(j)} \| U_m^{N-j} - U_m^{N-j} \|
\]
\[
\leq c \kappa \sum_{i=1}^n (n-i+1)^{\alpha-1} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \omega_\alpha^{(j)} \| U_m^{N-j} - U_m^{N-j} \|.
\]

Then Lemma 3.4 indicates that
\[
\| U_m^n \| \leq c \kappa \sum_{i=1}^n (n-i+1)^{\alpha-1} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (j+i)^{\alpha-1} \| U_m^{N-j} - U_m^{N-j} \|
\]
\[
= c \kappa \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \| U_m^{N-j} - U_m^{N-j} \| \sum_{i=1}^n (n-i+1)^{\alpha-1} (j+i)^{-\alpha-1}
\]
\[
\leq c \kappa \tau^{\alpha} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} t_j^{-\alpha} \| U_m^{N-j} - U_m^{N-j} \| \sum_{i=1}^n (n-i+1)^{\alpha-1} (j+i)^{-1}
\]
\[
\leq c \kappa \tau^{\alpha} \ln(n+1) \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N} t_j^{-\alpha} \| U_m^{N-j} - U_m^{N-j} \| \right).
\]

The last inequality follows from the estimate that \((3.11)\),
\[
\sum_{i=1}^n (n-i+1)^{\alpha-1} (j+i)^{-1} \leq c n^{-1} \ln(n+1).
\]
Multiplying $\tau t_N^{\alpha} \|U_m^{N-n+1}\|$ on (3.18) and summing over $n$, we derive that for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

$$
\tau \sum_{n=1}^{N} t_n^{-\alpha} \|U_m^{N-n+1}\| \leq c k \left( \tau \sum_{j=1}^{N} t_j^{-\alpha} \|U_m^{N-j+1} - U_m^{N-j+1}\| \right)
$$

$$
\leq c k \log(N) \left( \tau \sum_{n=1}^{N} t_n^{-\alpha} \|U_m^{N-n+1} - U_m^{N-n+1}\| \right)
$$

where the constant $c$ in the second inequality depends on $\alpha$. In the last inequality, we use the fact that

$$
\sum_{n=1}^{N} (N-n+1)^{-\alpha} n^{-\alpha-1} \leq \int_{n-1}^{n} (N-n+1)^{-\alpha} n^{-\alpha-1} \, ds
$$

$$
= \int_{0}^{1} (1-s)^{-\alpha} s^{-\alpha-1} \, ds = B(\alpha, 1-\alpha),
$$

where $B(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the Beta function.

Next, we apply triangle’s inequality, chose $\kappa$ small enough such that $c k \log(N) < 1$, and hence derive that

$$
\tau \sum_{n=1}^{N} t_n^{-\alpha} \|U_m^{N-n+1}\| \leq \frac{ck \log(N)}{1-c k \log(N)} \left( \tau \sum_{n=1}^{N} t_n^{-\alpha} \|U_m^{N-n+1}\| \right).
$$

Finally, we define

$$
\gamma(\kappa) = \frac{ck \log(N)}{1-c k \log(N)}.
$$

By choosing $\kappa$ such that $ck \log(N) \in (0, 1/2)$, we have $\gamma(\kappa) \in (0, 1)$. Therefore, by (3.18), we obtain that

$$
\|U_m^{n+1}\| \leq c t_n^{-\alpha} \log(N) \left( \tau \sum_{j=1}^{N} t_j^{-\alpha} \|U_m^{N-j+1} - U_m^{N-j+1}\| \right)
$$

$$
\leq c t_n^{-\alpha} \log(N) \left( \tau \sum_{j=1}^{N} t_j^{-\alpha} \|U_m^{N-j+1}\| + \tau \sum_{j=1}^{N} t_j^{-\alpha} \|U_m^{N-j+1}\| \right)
$$

$$
\leq c t_n^{-\alpha} \log(N) (1+\gamma(\kappa)) \tau \sum_{j=1}^{N} t_j^{-\alpha} \|U_m^{N-j+1}\|
$$

$$
\leq c t_n^{-\alpha} \gamma(\kappa) \left( \tau \sum_{j=1}^{N} t_j^{-\alpha} \|U_m^{N-j+1}\| \right).
$$

Then repeating the estimate (3.19) leads to the desired result.

Then the stability result in Lemma 3.3 leads to the convergence.

**Corollary 3.6.** Let $U_m^n$ be the solution to the iterative scheme (3.10), and $U^n$ be the solution to the $k$-step BDF scheme (3.2). Then we can choose a proper parameter $\kappa = O(1/\log(N))$ in (3.10), such that the following estimate holds valid:

$$
\|U^n - U_m^n\| \leq c t_n^{-\alpha} \gamma(\kappa) \left( \tau \sum_{j=1}^{N} t_j^{-\alpha} \|U_m^{N-j+1} - U_0^{N-j+1}\| \right), \quad \forall \ m \geq 1.
$$
Here the convergence factor \( \gamma(\kappa) \), given by (3.20), might depend on \( \kappa, \beta_0 \) and \( T \), but independent of \( \tau, n \) and \( m \).

Proof. To this end, we let \( e_m^n = (U_m^n - U^n) \) with \( 1 \leq n \leq N \), and note the fact that \( \{U^n\}_{n=1}^N \) is the fixed point of the iteration (2.5). Therefore \( e_m^n \) satisfies
\[
\frac{\partial^n}{\partial t^n} e_m^n + Ae_m^n = -\frac{\kappa^n}{\tau} K_m^n, \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots, N, \\
\gamma_m^n = 0, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, k - 1.
\]
(3.21)
where the term \( K_m^n \) is given by
\[
K_m^n = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \omega_{n+j}(e_{m-j}^N - e_{m-1}^{N-j}).
\]

Then the convergence estimate follows immediately from Lemma 3.3. \( \Box \)

Combining Corollary 3.6 with the estimate (3.9), we have the following error estimate of the iterative scheme (3.10).

**Theorem 3.7.** Suppose that the condition (1.2) and the assumption of data regularity (3.8) hold true. Let \( U_m^n \) be the solution to the iterative algorithm (3.10) with the initial guess \( U_0^n = v \) for all \( 0 \leq n \leq N \), and \( u \) be the exact solution to the subdiffusion equation (1.1). Then for \( 1 \leq n \leq N \), we have
\[
\|U_m^n - u(t_n)\| \leq c(\gamma(\kappa)^n t_n^{-\alpha} + \tau^k t_n^k), \quad \text{with} \quad \kappa = O(1/\log(N)),
\]
Here constant \( c \) and the convergence factor \( \gamma(\kappa) \) given by (3.20) might depend on \( k, \kappa, \beta_0, T, v \) and \( f \), but they are independent of \( \tau, n, m \) and \( u \).

Proof. We split the error into two parts:
\[
U_m^n - u(t_n) = (U_m^n - U^n) + (U^n - u(t_n)).
\]
The second term has the error bound by (3.9). Meanwhile, via Corollary 3.6, the first component converges to zero as \( m \rightarrow 0 \) and we have the estimate
\[
\|U^n - U_m^n\| \leq cT \gamma_n^{-\alpha}(\kappa)^m (\sum_{j=1}^{N} t_j^{-\alpha} \|U^{N-j+1} - v\|)
\]  
\[
\leq cT \gamma_n^{-\alpha}(\kappa)^m (\|v\| + \sum_{j=1}^{N} t_j^{-\alpha} \|U^{N-j+1}\|)
\]
Note that the estimate (3.9) and the assumption of data regularity (3.8) implies the uniform bound of \( U^n \) for all \( n = 1, 2, \ldots, N \), we obtain that
\[
\|U^n - U_m^n\| \leq cT \gamma_n^{-\alpha}(\kappa)^m.
\]
Then the desired result follows immediately. \( \Box \)

**Remark 3.1.** By the expression of the convergence factor \( \gamma(\kappa) \) in (3.20), we expect that the iteration converges linearly when \( c\kappa \log(N) \in (0, 1/2) \), i.e., \( \kappa < 1/(2c \log N) \). Besides, it implies that the convergence rate might deteriorate slightly for a large \( N \) and a fixed \( \kappa \). Surprisingly, our numerical results indicate that the iteration converges robustly even for relatively large \( \kappa \) (cf. Figure 4.2), and the step number \( N \) seems not affect the convergence rate (cf. Figure 4.2).

**4. Numerical Tests.** In this section, we present some numerical results to illustrate and complement our theoretical findings. The computational domain is the unit interval \( \Omega = (0, 1) \) for the Example 1 and Example 2, and the unit square \( \Omega = (0, 1)^2 \) for the Example 3. In space, it is discretized with piecewise linear Galerkin finite element method on a uniform mesh with mesh size \( h \) for one-dimensional problems. For two-dimensional problems, we compute numerical solutions on a uniform triangulation with mesh size \( h \). We focus on the convergence behavior of the iterative solver to the BDFk solution, since the temporal
convergence of BDFk scheme has been theoretically studied and numerically examined in [29]. That is, with the fixed time step size $\tau = T/N$, we measure the error in the $m$-th iteration

$$e^N_m := \| U^N_m - U^N \|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

where we take the BDFk solution $U^N$ as the reference solution.

### 4.1. Numerical results for normal diffusion.

**Example 4.1 (1D diffusion equation).** We begin with the following one-dimensional normal diffusion equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t u - \partial_{xx} u &= f(x,t), & \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T], \\
u &= 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0,T], \\
u(0) &= v, & \text{in } \Omega,
\end{aligned}$$

(4.1)

where $\Omega = (0,1)$ and $T = 0.5$. We consider the following problem data

$$v(x) = \chi_{(0,\frac{1}{2})}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad f(x,t) = e^t \cos(x),$$

where $\chi$ denotes the characteristic function.

First, we check the performance of the algorithm for different PinT BDFk schemes. Taking $\kappa = 0.5$ and $\tau = T/100$, the numerical results using the Algorithm 1 with different orders of BDF schemes are presented in Table 4.1. It can be seen that all the PinT BDFk schemes ($k \leq 6$) converge fast in a similar manner. In what follows, we take the PinT BDF3 scheme to check the influence of different $N$ (or $\tau$) and $\kappa$.

**Table 4.1: Example 4.1 $e^N_m$ for $T = 0.5$, $\tau = T/100$, $h = 1/1000$ and $\kappa = 0.5$.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$ \ BDFk</th>
<th>$k = 1$</th>
<th>$k = 2$</th>
<th>$k = 3$</th>
<th>$k = 4$</th>
<th>$k = 5$</th>
<th>$k = 6$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.20e-01</td>
<td>1.20e-01</td>
<td>1.20e-01</td>
<td>1.20e-01</td>
<td>1.20e-01</td>
<td>1.20e-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.98e-06</td>
<td>1.59e-06</td>
<td>1.60e-06</td>
<td>1.60e-06</td>
<td>1.60e-06</td>
<td>1.60e-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.05e-09</td>
<td>5.72e-09</td>
<td>5.79e-09</td>
<td>5.79e-09</td>
<td>5.79e-09</td>
<td>5.78e-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.81e-11</td>
<td>2.37e-11</td>
<td>1.98e-11</td>
<td>1.74e-11</td>
<td>1.92e-11</td>
<td>1.99e-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.76e-12</td>
<td>3.09e-12</td>
<td>1.11e-12</td>
<td>3.54e-12</td>
<td>1.81e-12</td>
<td>1.10e-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking $\kappa = 0.5$, we report the convergence histories with different time step sizes in Figure 4.1a. It is seen that the convergence rate is independent of $\tau$, which agrees well with the Corollary 2.6. In Figure 4.1b we plot the convergence histories with different $\kappa$. It can be seen that, with the decrease of $\kappa$, the convergence becomes faster, which is in agreement with the convergence rate in theory (2.18). On the other hand, the smaller $\kappa$ will lead to larger roundoff error, as we proved in Section 3.2. Hence, one needs to choose $\kappa$ properly to balance the convergence rate and roundoff error.

### 4.2. Numerical results for subdiffusion.

In this subsection, we test the performance of the algorithm for the subdiffusion problem in both 1D and 2D:

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial^\alpha_t u - \Delta u &= f(x,t), & \text{in } \Omega \times (0,T], \\
u &= 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega \times (0,T], \\
u(0) &= v, & \text{in } \Omega.
\end{aligned}$$

(4.2)

**Example 4.2 (1D subdiffusion equation).** In the one-dimensional problem, the computational domain is $\Omega = (0,1)$ with equally spaced mesh. The mesh size is set to be $h = 1/M$ with $M = 1000$. We consider...
the following problem data

\[ v = \delta_{1/2}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad f(x, t) = 0. \]

Here the initial data is the Dirac-delta measure concentrated at \( x = 1/2 \), which only belongs to \( H^{-1/2-\epsilon}(\Omega) \) for any \( \epsilon > 0 \). In the computation, the initial value is set to be the \( L^2 \)-projection of delta function; see some details in [28].

Even though the initial condition is very weak, the inverse inequality and the analysis in [28] implies the error estimate

\[ \| U_n - u(t_n) \| \leq c \left( \tau^k h^{-1/2-k-t_n^{-k}} + h^{3/2-t_n^{-\alpha}} \right), \]

and also the following convergence result

\[ \| U_n - U_{m} \| \leq ct_n^{\alpha-1} h^{-1/2-\epsilon} \gamma(\kappa)^m \]

with the same \( \gamma(\kappa) \) defined in (3.20).

Similar to the normal diffusion, the performance of all the PinT BDFk \((k \leq 6)\) have the same convergence profile, see Table 4.2. Moreover, we check the influence of different \( N \) (or \( \tau \)) and \( \kappa \) by using the PinT BDF3 scheme. Our theoretical result (3.20) indicates that the convergence factor is

\[ \gamma(\kappa) = \frac{ck \log(N)}{1 - ck \log(N)}, \]

with some generic constant \( c > 1 \). So we expect that the iteration converges linearly when \( c\kappa \log(N) \in (0, 1/2) \), i.e., \( \kappa < 1/(2c \log N) \). Besides, it implies that the convergence rate might deteriorate slightly for a large \( N \) and a fixed \( \kappa \). Surprisingly, our numerical results indicate that the iteration converges robustly even for relatively large \( \kappa \) (cf. Figure 4.2b), and the step number \( N \) seems not affect the convergence rate (cf. Figure 4.2a). From Figure 4.2b, we observe that the influence of \( \kappa \) is similar to the normal diffusion case: the smaller \( \kappa \) will lead to faster convergence rate but worse roundoff error. In practice, the choice \( \kappa \approx 10^{-1} \) leads to an acceptable roundoff error \((\approx 10^{-11})\), and meanwhile the convergence is fast.

**Example 4.3 (2D subdiffusion equation).** In this example, the spatial discretization is taken on the uniform triangulation of \( \Omega = (0, 1)^2 \). We consider the following problem data

\[ v(x) = \chi_{(0,1/2) \times (0,1/2)}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad f(x, t) = \cos(t)\chi_{(1/4,1/2) \times (1/4,1/2)}(x). \]
Table 4.2: Example 4.2 $e_m^N$ for $T = 0.1$, $\alpha = 0.5$, $\tau = T/100$, $h = 1/1000$ and $\kappa = 0.1$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$</th>
<th>BDFk</th>
<th>$k = 1$</th>
<th>$k = 2$</th>
<th>$k = 3$</th>
<th>$k = 4$</th>
<th>$k = 5$</th>
<th>$k = 6$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.46e-01</td>
<td>2.46e-01</td>
<td>2.46e-01</td>
<td>2.46e-01</td>
<td>2.46e-01</td>
<td>2.46e-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.88e-06</td>
<td>2.85e-06</td>
<td>2.84e-06</td>
<td>2.84e-06</td>
<td>2.85e-06</td>
<td>2.85e-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.34e-08</td>
<td>1.32e-08</td>
<td>1.32e-08</td>
<td>1.32e-08</td>
<td>1.32e-08</td>
<td>1.31e-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.12e-11</td>
<td>4.98e-11</td>
<td>4.98e-11</td>
<td>8.31e-11</td>
<td>4.27e-11</td>
<td>1.37e-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.88e-11</td>
<td>1.86e-11</td>
<td>1.86e-11</td>
<td>1.61e-11</td>
<td>3.44e-11</td>
<td>1.50e-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4.2: PinT BDF3 for Example 4.2 $\alpha = 0.5$, $T = 0.1$ and $h = 1/1000$.

The numerical solutions are computed on a uniform triangular mesh with $h = 10^{-2}$. We also observe that $\kappa$ needs to be properly chosen to balance the convergence rate and roundoff error, see Figure 4.3.

Recall that, in the analysis, there is a generic constant $c$ in the convergence rate (3.20), which depends on the fractional order $\alpha$ and $T$. We numerically check these dependences and present the results in Figure 4.4 and 4.5 respectively. Taking $\kappa = 1/\log(N)$, we observe the faster convergence rate with smaller $\alpha$ when $T$ is small, see Figure 4.4a. With the increase of $T$, these difference is getting smaller. Further, we...
observe the faster convergence rate with greater $T$ of the time-parallel algorithm to the semilinear (sub)diffusion problem (with advantage of the proposed method for long-time simulation.

22 for arbitrarily small $\epsilon$.

To numerically solve (4.3), we follow the similar idea introduced in Section 3 and consider the modified CQ-BDF$k$ scheme:

$$
\begin{align*}
\partial_t^n U - \Delta U^n + g(U^n) &= \bar{f}_n, & 1 \leq n \leq N, \\
U^n &= v, & n \leq 0,
\end{align*}
$$

(4.4)

where $\bar{f}_n := f(x, t_n) + \alpha_n(k) f(x, 0) + \Delta v - g(v) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-2} \ell \alpha_n^{(k-\ell)} \alpha_n^{(\ell)} f(x, 0)$. If $\alpha = 1$, it reduces to a modified BDF$k$ scheme for the classical semilinear parabolic equations. It was proved in [57, Theorem 3.4] that

$$
\|U^n - u(t_n)\| \leq cT^n e^{-\min(A, \frac{1}{1+2\alpha-\epsilon})},
$$

(4.5)

for arbitrarily small $\epsilon$.

4.3. Extension to nonlinear problems. In this part, we shall briefly discuss a possible application of the time-parallel algorithm to the semilinear (sub)diffusion problem (with $\alpha \in (0, 1]$):

$$
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
\partial_t^n u(t) + Au(t) + g(u(t)) = f(t), & \text{for all } t \in (0, T], \\
u(0) = v,
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
$$

(4.3)

Fig. 4.5: PinT BDF3 for Example 4.3 Influence of $T$ for the convergence rate, $\kappa = 1/\log(N)$, $\tau = 10^{-3}$ and $h = 10^{-2}$.
In order to solve the numerical solution in a time-parallel manner, we consider a modified Newton’s iteration to linearize the problem: for integer $\ell \geq 1$, we compute $U^n_\ell = U^{n-1}_\ell + W^n_\ell$ where $W^n_\ell$ satisfies homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition and

$$
(\partial^2_t - \Delta)W^n_\ell - g(U^{n-1}_\ell)W^n_\ell \! = \! \bar{f}_n - (\partial^2_t - \Delta)U^{n-1}_\ell - g(U^{n-1}_\ell), \quad 1 \leq n \leq N, \quad n \leq 0.
$$

(4.6)

Here $\bar{U}_{\ell-1}$ denotes an average of $U^{n-1}_\ell$ in all levels, defined as

$$
\bar{U}_{\ell-1} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} U^{n-1}_\ell.
$$

Then, for each iteration, we shall solve the linear system (4.6) with a time-independent coefficient. Therefore, we can apply the strategy in Sections 2 and 3, i.e., applying waveform relaxation to derive an iterative solver: with $W^n_{\ell,0} = 0$ and $m = 1, 2, \ldots$, for given $W^n_{\ell,m-1}$, we compute $W^n_{\ell,m}$ such that

$$
(\partial^2_t - \Delta)W^n_{\ell,m} - g(\bar{U}_{\ell-1})W^n_{\ell,m} = \bar{f}_n - (\partial^2_t - \Delta)U^{n-1}_\ell - g(U^{n-1}_\ell), \quad n = 1, 2, \ldots, N,
$$

$$
W^{-n}_{\ell,m} = \kappa(W^{n-N}_{\ell,m} - W^{N-n}_{\ell,m}), \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots, N + 1,
$$

$$
W^n_{\ell,m} = 0, \quad n \leq -N.
$$

(4.7)

This is a periodic-like system and hence it could be solved in parallel by diagonalization technique. We describe the complete iterative algorithm in Algorithm 3.

**Algorithm 3** PinT BDF$k$ scheme for nonlinear models.

1: Initialize $U^n_0 = v$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and set $\ell = 0$.
2: for $\ell = 1, \ldots, L$ do
3: Initialize $W^n_{\ell,0} = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and set $m = 0$.
4: for $m = 1, \ldots, m_\ell$ do
5: Solve $W^n_{\ell,m}$ satisfying (4.6) in a time parallel manner using Algorithm 1 or 2.
6: Check the stopping criterion of waveform relaxation.
7: end for
8: Update $U^n_\ell = U^{n-1}_\ell + W^n_{\ell,m}$.
9: Check the stopping criterion of Newton’s iteration.
10: end for

**Example 4.4** (Allen–Cahn equations). Taking $A = -\Delta$, $H = L^2(\Omega)$, $V = H^1_0(\Omega)$ and $g(u) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}(u^3 - u)$ in (4.5), we obtain the nonlinear problem with $\alpha \in (0, 1]$:

$$
\begin{cases}
\partial^2_t u - \Delta u + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}(u^3 - u) = f(x, t) & \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\
u = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Omega \times (0, T), \\
u(0) = v & \text{in } \Omega.
\end{cases}
$$

(4.8)

In case that $\alpha = 1$ and $f(x, t) = 0$, the model is called Allen–Cahn equation, which is a popular phase-field model, introduced in [1] to describe the motion of anti-phase boundaries in crystalline solids. In the context, $u$ represents the concentration of one of the two metallic components of the alloy and the parameter $\varepsilon$ involved in the nonlinear term represents the interfacial width, which is small compared to the characteristic length of the laboratory scale; see also [2] [3] [63] for some applications and [9] for some discussion for fractional models with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

We shall investigate the numerical performance of Algorithm 3 on the domain $\Omega = (0, 1)$ with equally spaced mesh. The exterior force $f(x, t)$ is chosen such that the exact solution yields $u = \frac{\varepsilon}{\tau(\xi)} \sin(2\pi x)$. 
First of all, we test the nonlinear problem (4.8) with $\varepsilon = 1$ (mild nonlinearity), and report the error of Newton’s iteration, i.e., $e^N_\ell = \|U^N_\ell - U^N\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. In the computation, we and chose the stopping criteria of inner iteration (waveform relaxation) as

$$\|W_{\ell,m}^n - W_{\ell,m}^{n-1}\|_\infty < 1 \times 10^{-12} \quad \text{for all } \ell \in \mathbb{N}^+.$$ 

The numbers of inner iteration are listed in the bracket. Invoking the error estimate (4.5), we report the numerical results for $\alpha = 0.25$ (with BDF1 and BDF2) and $\alpha = 0.75$ (with BDF1, BDF2 and BDF3) in Table 4.3. Numerical results in Table 4.3 indicate that the inner iteration (waveform relaxation) converges robustly and quickly for the linearized system (4.6), and the modified Newton’s iteration converges fast for both cases ($\alpha = 0.25$ and $\alpha = 0.75$), so does the Algorithm 3.

Table 4.3: Example 4.4: $e^N_\ell$ with $T = 0.4$, $\tau = T/100$, $h = 1/1000$, $\kappa = 0.1$, and $\varepsilon = 1$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\ell$</th>
<th>BDFk</th>
<th>$k = 1$</th>
<th>$k = 2$</th>
<th>$k = 3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.30e-02</td>
<td>6.30e-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.27e-06(5)</td>
<td>9.27e-06(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64e-09(4)</td>
<td>3.63e-09(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.42e-12(3)</td>
<td>1.42e-12(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\ell$</th>
<th>BDFk</th>
<th>$k = 1$</th>
<th>$k = 2$</th>
<th>$k = 3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.94e-02</td>
<td>5.94e-02</td>
<td>5.94e-02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.83e-06(5)</td>
<td>6.80e-06(5)</td>
<td>6.80e-06(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.95e-09(4)</td>
<td>1.92e-09(4)</td>
<td>1.92e-09(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.23e-13(3)</td>
<td>5.06e-13(3)</td>
<td>5.03e-13(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4.6: PinT BDF3 for Example 4.4: Influence of the strength of nonlinearity.

Next, we investigate the influence of the strength of nonlinearity for both subdiffusion and normal diffusion cases in Figure 4.6. As can be seen from Table 4.3, the convergence behaviors of Algorithm 3 are insensitive with various BDF$k$ schemes, and hence the results of BDF2 scheme are presented. We observe that strong nonlinearity will lower the convergence rate, not only due to the strong nonlinearity itself to the Newton’s iteration, but also possibly to the more inaccurate average $U_{\ell-1}$ in (4.6). As the nonlinearity getting stronger, for example $\varepsilon = 0.05$ with $\alpha = 0.75$ or $\alpha = 1$, the modified Newton’s iteration does not converge. It is reasonable that the accuracy of average $U_{\ell-1}$ hinges on the variation of the solutions on certain time interval. Practically, a windowing technique could be used in this algorithm: after a certain number of time steps computed in parallel in the current time window, the computation can be restarted for the next time window in a sequential way. This is beyond the scope of current paper and can be considered in the future.
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