

A modified block alternating splitting iteration method for solving a class of two-by-two block complex linear systems

Davod Khojasteh Salkuyeh^{†‡*}, Maeddeh Pourbagher[†]

[†]Faculty of Mathematical Sciences, University of Guilan, Rasht, Iran

[‡]Center of Excellence for Mathematical Modelling, Optimization and Combinational Computing (MMOCC), University of Guilan, Rasht, Iran
Emails: khojasteh@guilan.ac.ir, mapourbagher@gmail.com

Abstract. A modified version of the block alternating splitting (MBAS) iteration method is presented for solving the system arising from finite element discretization of the distributed optimal control problem with time-periodic parabolic equations. We prove that the MBAS iteration method is unconditionally convergent. We also present an estimation formula for the iteration parameter of the MBAS preconditioner. Numerical results are presented to verify the efficiency of both the MBAS iteration method and the MBAS preconditioner.

Keywords: Iterative, finite element, PDE-constrained, convergence, iteration parameter, preconditioner.

AMS Subject Classification: 49M25, 49K20, 65F10, 65F50.

1 Introduction

We are concerned with the following distributed control problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{y,u} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} |y(x,t) - y_d(x,t)|^2 dxdt + \frac{\nu}{2} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} |u(x,t)|^2 dxdt, \\ \text{s.t: } \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} y(x,t) - \Delta y(x,t) = u(x,t) \quad \text{in } Q_T, \\ \quad \quad \quad y(x,t) = 0 \quad \quad \quad \text{on } \Sigma_T, \\ \quad \quad \quad y(x,0) = y(x,T) \quad \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ \quad \quad \quad u(x,0) = u(x,T) \quad \quad \text{in } \Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where Ω is an open and bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^d for $d \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ with Lipschitz-continuous boundary $\partial\Omega$. The space-time cylinder and its lateral surface for $T > 0$ are defined as $Q_T = \Omega \times (0, T)$ and $\Sigma_T = \partial\Omega \times (0, T)$, respectively. Here $y_d(x, t)$ is a given target and $\nu > 0$ is a cost or regularization parameter. We assume that the function $y_d(x, t)$ is time-harmonic, which means that $y_d(x, t) = y_d(x) e^{i\omega t}$ with $\omega = 2m\pi/T$, for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. It can be proved that there is a time-periodic solution for the original problem as $y(x, t) = y(x) e^{i\omega t}$ and $u(x, t) = u(x) e^{i\omega t}$, where $y(x)$ and $u(x)$ solve the following time-independent optimal control problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{y,u} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |y(x) - y_d(x)|^2 dx + \frac{\nu}{2} \int_{\Omega} |u(x)|^2 dx, \\ \text{s.t: } \quad i\omega y(x) - \Delta y(x) = u(x,t) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ \quad \quad \quad y(x) = 0 \quad \quad \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Discretizing the obtained optimal control problem using the finite element method results in an optimization problem. If we define the corresponding Lagrangian functional with the Lagrange multiplier \bar{p} , then the first order necessary conditions which are also sufficient for the existence of a solution is obtained as the following complex system of linear equations (see [3])

$$Ax \equiv \begin{pmatrix} M & \sqrt{\nu}(K - i\omega M) \\ \sqrt{\nu}(K + i\omega M) & -M \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{y} \\ \bar{q} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} M\bar{y}_d \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \equiv b, \quad (1)$$

with $\bar{u} = \bar{p}/\nu$ and $\bar{q} = \bar{p}/\sqrt{\nu}$, where \bar{y} , \bar{y}_d , and \bar{u} are the coefficient vectors of the corresponding finite element basis functions of $y(x, t)$, $y_d(x, t)$ and $u(x, t)$, respectively. Moreover, $M, K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ are the mass and stiffness matrices, respectively.

*Corresponding author.

Since the coefficient matrix of (1) is of large size, iterative methods such as the ones based on the Krylov subspace are employed to solve the system. In order to accelerate the convergence of iterative methods suitable preconditioners should be manipulated. In [3], Krendl et al. proposed the real block diagonal and the alternative indefinite preconditioners for the system (1). Zheng et al. in [8] presented an improved version of the block diagonal preconditioner \mathcal{P}_{BD} . The block alternating splitting (BAS) iteration method was presented by Zheng et al. in [7] for solving the system (1) which can be written as

$$\begin{cases} (\alpha V + H_1)x^{(k+\frac{1}{2})} = (\alpha V - S_1)x^{(k)} + P_1b, \\ (\alpha V + \sqrt{\nu}H_2)x^{(k+1)} = (\alpha V - S_2)x^{(k+\frac{1}{2})} + P_2b, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha > 0$, $V \in \mathbb{R}^{2m \times 2m}$ is a symmetric positive definite (SPD) matrix, $H_1 = \text{bldiag}(M, M)$, $H_2 = \text{bldiag}(K, K)$ and

$$S_1 = \frac{1}{\theta} \begin{pmatrix} -i\omega\nu K & \sqrt{\nu}K \\ -\sqrt{\nu}K & i\omega\nu K \end{pmatrix}, \quad S_2 = \begin{pmatrix} i\omega\sqrt{\nu}M & -M \\ M & -i\omega\sqrt{\nu}M \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_1 = \frac{1}{\theta} \begin{pmatrix} I & -i\omega\sqrt{\nu}I \\ i\omega\sqrt{\nu}I & -I \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

in which $\theta = 1 + \nu\omega^2$. In practice the authors suggest to use the matrix $V = H_1$ as a preconditioner and proved that the method is convergent under the condition $\alpha \geq \nu\omega^2/2$. In this case, two systems with the coefficient matrix M and two with $\alpha M + \sqrt{\nu}K$ should be solved in each iteration of BAS, which can be solved exactly using the Cholesky factorization or inexactly using the conjugate gradient (CG) method. The BAS iteration method induces the following preconditioner

$$P_{BAS}(\alpha) = \frac{1 + \alpha}{\alpha(1 + \theta)} \begin{pmatrix} I & (\theta - i\omega\sqrt{\nu})I \\ (\theta + i\omega\sqrt{\nu})I & -I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha M + \sqrt{\nu}K & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha M + \sqrt{\nu}K \end{pmatrix}.$$

In the implementation of BAS preconditioner, we need to solve two systems with the coefficient matrix $\alpha M + \sqrt{\nu}K$ which can be solved either exactly using Cholesky factorization or inexactly using CG. The reported numerical results in [7] show that $\alpha = \theta$ and $\alpha = \theta/(1 + \sqrt{\nu}\omega)$ are good choices for the BAS iteration and the BAS preconditioner, respectively. Recently, Salkuyeh in [6] reformulated the system (1) in the following real form

$$Ay \equiv \begin{pmatrix} M & 0 & \sqrt{\nu}K & \omega\sqrt{\nu}M \\ 0 & M & -\omega\sqrt{\nu}M & \sqrt{\nu}K \\ \sqrt{\nu}K & -\omega\sqrt{\nu}M & -M & 0 \\ \omega\sqrt{\nu}M & \sqrt{\nu}K & 0 & -M \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Re(\bar{y}) \\ \Im(\bar{y}) \\ \Re(\bar{q}) \\ \Im(\bar{q}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Re(\hat{y}_d) \\ \Im(\hat{y}_d) \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \equiv c, \quad (3)$$

and presented the Alternating Symmetric positive definite and Scaled symmetric positive semidefinite Splitting (ASSS) for solving the system (1). The ASSS iteration method can be stated as

$$\begin{cases} (\alpha\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{M})y^{(k+\frac{1}{2})} = (\alpha\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{G}\mathcal{K})y^{(k)} + c, \\ (\alpha\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{K})y^{(k+1)} = (\alpha\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{G}\mathcal{M})y^{(k+\frac{1}{2})} - \mathcal{G}c, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where $\alpha > 0$, \mathcal{I} is the identity matrix of order $4m$, $\mathcal{M} = \text{bldiag}(M, M, M, M)$, $\hat{\mathcal{K}} = \text{bldiag}(K, K, K, K)$, $\mathcal{K} = \sqrt{\frac{\nu}{\theta}}\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ and

$$\mathcal{G} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu\theta}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \omega\nu I & \sqrt{\nu}I & 0 \\ -\omega\nu I & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{\nu}I \\ -\sqrt{\nu}I & 0 & 0 & -\omega\nu I \\ 0 & -\sqrt{\nu}I & \omega\nu I & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

He proved that the ASSS iteration method is convergent unconditionally. The ASSS iteration method induces the preconditioner

$$\mathcal{P}_\alpha = \frac{1}{\alpha}(\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{G})^{-1}(\alpha\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{M})\mathcal{G}(\alpha\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{K}),$$

for the system (3). In each iteration of ASSS, as well as in the implementation of the ASSS preconditioner in a Krylov subspace method, four systems with $\alpha I + M$ and four with $\alpha I + \sqrt{\frac{\nu}{\theta}}K$ should be solved which can be treated similar to the BAS iteration method. The presented numerical results in [6] show that $\alpha^* = \sqrt{\mu_{\min}\mu_{\max}}$ is a good choice for the ASSS iteration method and the ASSS preconditioner, where μ_{\min} and μ_{\max} are the smallest and largest eigenvalues of the matrix M , respectively. The main advantage of the ASSS iteration method over the BAS iteration method is that ASSS is unconditionally convergent, but this is not the case for the BAS iteration method. The BAS iteration essentially solves a system of order $2m$, whereas the ASSS iteration method solves a system of order $4m$, which is weak point of ASSS. In this paper we present a modified version BAS (MBAS) for solving the system (1) and prove that it is convergent unconditionally.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present the MBAS iteration method and investigate its convergence. Some numerical experiments are given in Section 4. Concluding remarks are drawn in Section 5.

2 The MBAS iteration method

Letting

$$R_1 = \begin{pmatrix} I & -i\omega\sqrt{\nu}I \\ i\omega\sqrt{\nu}I & -I \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad R_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{\nu}I \\ \sqrt{\nu}I & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

the system (1) can be written as the following form

$$Ax \equiv (R_1H_1 + R_2H_2)x = b. \quad (5)$$

It can be readily seen that $R_1^H R_1 = \theta I$ and $R_2^H R_2 = \nu I$. In addition, we have

$$R := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu\theta}} R_1^H R_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu\theta}} \begin{pmatrix} -i\omega\nu I & \sqrt{\nu}I \\ -\sqrt{\nu}I & i\omega\nu I \end{pmatrix}.$$

Lemma 1. *R is skew-Hermitian, unitary and satisfies $R^2 = -I$.*

Proof. The proof is straightforward and is omitted. □

Pre-multiplying both sides of (5) by R_1^H , gives

$$\left(R_1^H R_1 H_1 + R_1^H R_2 H_2 \right) x = R_1^H b,$$

which is equivalence to

$$\tilde{A}x \equiv \left(\theta H_1 + \sqrt{\nu\theta} R H_2 \right) x = \tilde{b}, \quad (6)$$

where $\tilde{b} = R_1^H b$. For every $\alpha > 0$, by adding αI to the both sides of (6) we get

$$(\alpha I + \theta H_1) x = \left(\alpha I - \sqrt{\nu\theta} R H_2 \right) x + \tilde{b}. \quad (7)$$

On the other hand, by adding αR to both sides of Eq. (6), we obtain the following equation

$$\left(\alpha R + \sqrt{\nu\theta} R H_2 \right) x = (\alpha R - \theta H_1) x + \tilde{b}.$$

Since $R^{-1} = -R$, by multiplying both sides of the above equation by R^{-1} , we get

$$\left(\alpha I + \sqrt{\nu\theta} H_2 \right) x = (\alpha I + \theta R H_1) x - R\tilde{b}. \quad (8)$$

Using Eqs. (7) and (8), we state the MBAS iteration method for solving the system (6) as following.

The MBAS iterative method. *Let $x^{(0)} \in \mathbb{C}^{2n}$ be an initial guess. For $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, until the sequence of iterates $\{x^{(k)}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ converges, compute the next iterate $x^{(k+1)}$ via:*

$$\begin{cases} (\alpha I + \theta H_1) x^{(k+\frac{1}{2})} = \left(\alpha I - \sqrt{\nu\theta} R H_2 \right) x^{(k)} + \tilde{b}, \\ \left(\alpha I + \sqrt{\nu\theta} H_2 \right) x^{(k+1)} = (\alpha I + \theta R H_1) x^{(k+\frac{1}{2})} - R\tilde{b}, \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where α is a given positive constant.

In the first half-step of MBAS two systems with the coefficient matrix $\alpha I + \theta M$ should be solved and in second half-step two systems with the coefficient matrix $\alpha I + \sqrt{\nu\theta} K$. Since both of these matrices are SPD, the corresponding systems can be solved exactly using the Cholesky factorization or inexactly using the CG method. Hence, the complexity of BAS and MBAS are the same.

By eliminating the vector $x^{(k+\frac{1}{2})}$ from Eq. (9) we get

$$x^{(k+1)} = P_\alpha x^{(k)} + Q_\alpha \tilde{b}, \quad (10)$$

where the iteration matrix of the method is given by

$$P_\alpha = \left(\alpha I + \sqrt{\nu\theta} H_2 \right)^{-1} (\alpha I + \theta R H_1) (\alpha I + \theta H_1)^{-1} \left(\alpha I - \sqrt{\nu\theta} R H_2 \right),$$

and $Q_\alpha = \alpha \left(\alpha I + \sqrt{\nu\theta} H_2 \right)^{-1} (I - R) (\alpha I + \theta H_1)^{-1}$. If we define

$$B_\alpha = \frac{1}{\alpha} (I + R)^{-1} (\alpha I + \theta H_1) R \left(\alpha I + \sqrt{\nu\theta} H_2 \right) \quad \text{and} \quad C_\alpha = \frac{1}{\alpha} (I + R)^{-1} (\alpha R - \theta H_1) \left(\alpha I - \sqrt{\nu\theta} R H_2 \right), \quad (11)$$

then $\tilde{A} = B_\alpha - C_\alpha$ and $P_\alpha = B_\alpha^{-1}C_\alpha$. Hence, the MBAS iteration method is obtained using splitting $\tilde{A} = B_\alpha - C_\alpha$. Therefore, B_α can be used as a preconditioner for the system (6). It follows from Lemma 1 we deduce $R^{-1} = -R$. Hence,

$$B_\alpha^{-1} = -\alpha \left(\alpha I + \sqrt{\nu\theta}H_2 \right)^{-1} R (\alpha I + \theta H_1)^{-1} (I + R)$$

Hence, in the implementation of the preconditioner B_α in Krylov subspace method like GMRES two systems with the coefficient matrices $\alpha I + \sqrt{\nu\theta}H_2$ and $\alpha I + \theta H_1$ should be solved which can be done using the Cholesky factorization or the CG method. The next theorem investigates the convergence of the MBAS iteration method.

Theorem 1. *Let $M, K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ be SPD matrices and ν and ω be two given positive constants. Then for every $\alpha > 0$, we have*

$$\rho(P_\alpha) \leq \eta_\alpha = \max_{\lambda \in \sigma(M)} \frac{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \theta^2 \lambda^2}}{\alpha + \theta \lambda} \max_{\mu \in \sigma(K)} \frac{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \nu \theta \mu^2}}{\alpha + \sqrt{\nu \theta} \mu} < 1,$$

where P_α is the MBAS iteration matrix. This shows that the MBAS iteration method converges unconditionally. Here $\rho(\cdot)$ and $\sigma(\cdot)$ are the spectral radius and the spectrum of a matrix, respectively.

Proof. It is easy to see that the matrix P_α is similar to

$$\tilde{P}_\alpha = (\alpha I + \sqrt{\nu\theta}H_2)P_\alpha(\alpha I + \sqrt{\nu\theta}H_2)^{-1} = U_\alpha V_\alpha,$$

where $U_\alpha = (\alpha I + \theta R H_1)(\alpha I + \theta H_1)^{-1}$ and $V_\alpha = (\alpha I - \sqrt{\nu\theta}R H_2)(\alpha I + \sqrt{\nu\theta}H_2)^{-1}$. Then we have

$$\rho(P_\alpha) = \rho(\tilde{P}_\alpha) = \rho(U_\alpha V_\alpha) \leq \|U_\alpha V_\alpha\|_2 \leq \|U_\alpha\|_2 \|V_\alpha\|_2.$$

On the other hand, we have $R^2 = -I$, $R^H = -R$, $RH_1 = H_1R$ and $RH_2 = H_2R$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_\alpha\|_2^2 &= \rho((\alpha I + \theta H_1)^{-1}(\alpha I - \theta H_1 R)(\alpha I + \theta R H_1)(\alpha I + \theta H_1)^{-1}) \\ &= \rho((\alpha I + \theta H_1)^{-2}(\alpha^2 I + \alpha \theta R H_1 - \alpha \theta H_1 R - \theta^2 H_1 R^2 H_1)) \\ &= \rho((\alpha I + \theta H_1)^{-2}(\alpha I + \theta^2 H_1^2)) = \max_{\lambda \in \sigma(H_1)} \frac{\alpha^2 + \theta^2 \lambda^2}{(\alpha + \theta \lambda)^2} = \max_{\lambda \in \sigma(M)} \frac{\alpha^2 + \theta^2 \lambda^2}{(\alpha + \theta \lambda)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

In the same way, we see that

$$\|V_\alpha\|_2^2 = \max_{\mu \in \sigma(K)} \frac{\alpha^2 + \nu \theta \mu^2}{(\alpha + \sqrt{\nu \theta} \mu)^2}. \quad (13)$$

Since the matrices M and K are SPD, we have $\lambda, \mu > 0$, for all $\lambda \in \sigma(M)$ and $\mu \in \sigma(K)$, accordingly we conclude that

$$\chi(\alpha) := \frac{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \theta^2 \lambda^2}}{\alpha + \theta \lambda} < 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \vartheta(\alpha) := \frac{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + \nu \theta \mu^2}}{\alpha + \sqrt{\nu \theta} \mu} < 1.$$

Thus, $\rho(P_\alpha) \leq \eta_\alpha = \|U_\alpha\|_2 \|V_\alpha\|_2 < 1$, which completes the proof. \square

Remark 1. *Clearly from the proof of Theorem 1 it can be concluded if the matrices M and K are symmetric positive semidefinite with at least one of them being positive definite, then the MBAS iteration method still converges unconditionally for all $\alpha > 0$. Obviously, we have $\rho(P_\alpha) \leq \chi(\alpha)$ and $\rho(P_\alpha) \leq \vartheta(\alpha)$. Therefore, similar to Remark 2 in [6] the values $\alpha_1 = \theta \sqrt{\lambda_{\min} \lambda_{\max}}$ and $\alpha_2 = \sqrt{\nu \theta} \mu_{\min} \mu_{\max}$ minimize the upper bounds $\chi(\alpha)$ and $\vartheta(\alpha)$, respectively. Here, λ_{\min} (resp. μ_{\min}) and λ_{\max} (resp. μ_{\max}) are the smallest and largest eigenvalues of M (resp. K).*

3 Parameter estimation

In this section, using the idea of Ren and Cao [4] we present a strategy for estimating the iteration parameter α of the MBAS preconditioner. Using the matrix C_α given in Eq. (11) we define the function φ as

$$\varphi(\alpha) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \|(I + R)^{-1} \|_F (\alpha \|R\|_F - \theta \|H_1\|_F) (\alpha \|I\|_F - \sqrt{\nu\theta} \|RH_2\|_F). \quad (14)$$

To estimate the iteration parameter α , we set $\alpha \|R\|_F - \theta \|H_1\|_F = 0$, which gives $\alpha = \theta \frac{\|H_1\|_F}{\|R\|_F}$. Since

$$\|R\|_F^2 = \text{trace}(R^H R) = \text{trace}(-R^2) = \text{trace}(I) = 2m,$$

and $\|H_1\|_F^2 = \|M\|_F^2 + \|M\|_F^2 = 2\|M\|_F^2$, the estimation formula for the iteration parameter α of the MBAS preconditioner takes the following form

$$\alpha_{est} = \theta \frac{\sqrt{2} \|M\|_F}{\sqrt{2m}} = \theta \frac{\|M\|_F}{\sqrt{m}}. \quad (15)$$

We will shortly see in the next section that α_{est} gives often suitable results. Another choice for estimating the parameter α is to set $\alpha \|I\|_F - \sqrt{\nu\theta} \|RH_2\|_F = 0$, however it is less effective than the one given by (15).

Table 1: The values of an estimation and optimal parameter α of both the MBAS iteration method and the MBAS preconditioner for $h = 2^{-7}$ and different values of ν and ω .

	$\nu \setminus \omega$	10^{-4}	10^{-3}	10^{-2}	10^{-1}	1	10	10^2	10^3	10^4
α_{est}	10^{-2}	0.00003	0.00003	0.00003	0.00003	0.000031	0.000061	0.003080	0.304939	30.490909
	10^{-4}	0.00003	0.00003	0.00003	0.00003	0.00003	0.000031	0.000061	0.003080	0.304939
	10^{-6}	0.00003	0.00003	0.00003	0.00003	0.00003	0.00003	0.000031	0.000061	0.003080
	10^{-8}	0.00003	0.00003	0.00003	0.00003	0.00003	0.00003	0.00003	0.000031	0.000061
α_{opt}	10^{-2}	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.0001	0.005	0.4	45
	10^{-4}	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00009	0.004	0.5
	10^{-6}	0.000045	0.000045	0.000045	0.000045	0.000045	0.000045	0.000045	0.00009	0.005
	10^{-8}	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.0001
α_{opt}^*	10^{-2}	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.005	0.4	45
	10^{-4}	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00009	0.004	0.5
	10^{-6}	0.000045	0.000045	0.000045	0.000045	0.000045	0.000045	0.000045	0.00009	0.005
	10^{-8}	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.00005	0.0001

4 Numerical results

All of the numerical results are performed in MATLAB R2018b by using a Laptop with 2.50 GHz central processing unit (Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-7200U), 6 GB RAM and Windows 10. We consider the investigated distributed control problem with the target state

$$y_d(x, y) = \begin{cases} (2x - 1)^2(2y - 1)^2, & \text{if } (x, y) \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \times (0, \frac{1}{2}), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

We discretize the problem using the bilinear quadrilateral **Q1** finite elements (see [2]) with a uniform mesh of mesh-size $h = 2^{-7}$. In Table 1 we present the value of α_{est} computed by (15), the optimal value of α for the MBAS iteration method (denoted by α_{opt}) and the optimal value of α for the MBAS preconditioner (denoted by α_{opt}^*). It is noted that the values of α_{opt} and α_{opt}^* have been computed experimentally. We use $\alpha = \theta$ for the BAS method and apply $\alpha = \theta/(1 + \sqrt{\nu\omega})$ for the BAS preconditioner. We also use the value of α as suggested in [6] for both the ASSS iteration method and the ASSS preconditioner.

For all the iteration methods a null vector is used as an initial guess and the iteration is terminated as soon as the residual vector 2-norm is reduced by a factor of 10^6 . The number of iterations along with the CPU time (in seconds) are reported in the tables. The maximum number of iterations is set to be 500. A dagger (\dagger) in the tables show that the method has not converged in the maximum number of iterations. All the subsystems are solved exactly using the sparse Cholesky factorization incorporated with the symmetric approximate minimum degree permutation. To do so, the `symamd.m` command of MATLAB has been applied.

We first compare the numerical results of MBAS with those of BAS and ASSS. Numerical results for different values of ν and ω have been presented in Table 2. As the numerical results show the MBAS iteration method outperforms the ASSS iteration method. On the other hand, for small values of ω the results of MBAS and BAS are comparable. However for large values of ω the BAS iteration method can not compete with MBAS.

In continuation we compare the numerical results of the MBAS preconditioner (denoted by P-MBAS) with those of the BAS and ASSS (denoted by P-BAS and P-ASSS, respectively) preconditioners. We use these preconditioners to accelerate the convergence of the full GMRES method [5]. Numerical results have been reported in Table 3. As the numerical results show the MBAS preconditioner outperforms the ASSS preconditioner. On the other have for large values of ω the proposed preconditioner is superior to the BAS preconditioner.

5 Conclusion

We have presented a modified version of BAS iteration method [8] called MBAS, which is unconditionally convergent. Numerical results show that the MBAS iteration method outperforms the ASSS and BAS iteration methods. Also, the numerical results demonstrate that the MBAS preconditioner is superior to the ASSS preconditioner and can compete with the BAS preconditioner.

References

- [1] Z.-Z. Bai, M. Benzi and F. Chen, Modified HSS iteration methods for a class of complex symmetric linear systems, *Computing* 87 (2010) 93–111.

Table 2: Numerical results for the BAS, MBAS and ASSS iteration methods. Number of iterations along with the elapsed CPU time (in parenthesis).

Method	$\nu \backslash \omega$	10^{-4}	10^{-3}	10^{-2}	10^{-1}	1	10	10^2	10^3	10^4
MBAS ($\alpha = \alpha_{est}$)	10^{-2}	46(1.00)	46(1.00)	46(1.00)	46(0.99)	46(0.98)	45(0.98)	42(0.90)	36(0.80)	42(0.90)
	10^{-4}	42(0.96)	42(0.91)	42(0.91)	42(0.92)	42(0.90)	42(0.90)	41(0.89)	36(0.79)	42(0.90)
	10^{-6}	36(0.83)	36(0.80)	36(0.80)	36(0.80)	36(0.80)	36(0.80)	36(0.79)	37(0.82)	42(0.90)
	10^{-8}	42(0.96)	42(0.92)	42(0.91)	42(0.91)	42(0.91)	42(0.90)	42(0.90)	42(0.90)	43(0.92)
MBAS ($\alpha = \alpha_{opt}$)	10^{-2}	40(0.98)	40(0.86)	40(0.86)	40(0.84)	40(0.86)	39(0.88)	37(0.85)	34(0.84)	38(0.90)
	10^{-4}	38(0.88)	38(0.84)	38(0.84)	38(0.84)	38(0.83)	37(0.81)	37(0.86)	34(0.81)	38(0.90)
	10^{-6}	34(0.80)	34(0.77)	34(0.77)	34(0.75)	34(0.76)	34(0.76)	34(0.76)	34(0.82)	38(0.88)
	10^{-8}	38(0.88)	38(0.84)	38(0.83)	38(0.83)	38(0.84)	38(0.87)	38(0.86)	38(0.83)	38(0.88)
BAS	10^{-2}	39(0.89)	39(0.86)	39(0.85)	39(0.87)	38(0.85)	24(0.57)	465(9.70)	†	†
	10^{-4}	36(0.83)	36(0.82)	36(0.82)	36(0.80)	36(0.80)	36(0.80)	39(0.87)	†	†
	10^{-6}	33(0.78)	33(0.75)	33(0.75)	33(0.76)	33(0.75)	33(0.74)	33(0.75)	56(1.21)	†
	10^{-8}	38(0.89)	38(0.86)	38(0.85)	38(0.85)	38(0.85)	38(0.85)	38(0.84)	38(0.84)	64(1.36)
ASSS	10^{-2}	57(1.66)	57(1.53)	57(1.53)	57(1.55)	57(1.54)	56(1.51)	53(1.45)	44(1.20)	51(1.38)
	10^{-4}	53(1.46)	53(1.43)	53(1.45)	53(1.43)	53(1.43)	53(1.43)	52(1.42)	44(1.21)	51(1.40)
	10^{-6}	44(1.24)	44(1.22)	44(1.23)	44(1.22)	44(1.21)	44(1.21)	44(1.26)	43(1.19)	51(1.38)
	10^{-8}	51(1.41)	51(1.39)	51(1.40)	51(1.38)	51(1.39)	51(1.39)	51(1.39)	51(1.39)	52(1.40)

Table 3: Numerical results for the BAS, MBAS and ASSS preconditioners. Number of iterations along with the elapsed CPU time (in parenthesis).

Method	$\nu \backslash \omega$	10^{-4}	10^{-3}	10^{-2}	10^{-1}	1	10	10^2	10^3	10^4
P-MBAS ($\alpha = \alpha_{est}$)	10^{-2}	31(1.60)	31(1.50)	31(1.48)	31(1.45)	31(1.46)	31(1.44)	32(1.50)	34(1.56)	28(1.34)
	10^{-4}	32(1.65)	32(1.55)	32(1.50)	32(1.54)	32(1.50)	32(1.50)	32(1.50)	34(1.58)	28(1.35)
	10^{-6}	32(1.62)	32(1.56)	32(1.50)	32(1.49)	32(1.50)	32(1.49)	32(1.49)	32(1.49)	28(1.35)
	10^{-8}	27(1.42)	27(1.35)	27(1.33)	27(1.30)	27(1.31)	27(1.30)	27(1.30)	27(1.30)	27(1.30)
P-MBAS ($\alpha = \alpha_{opt}^*$)	10^{-2}	25(1.40)	25(1.39)	25(1.36)	25(1.37)	25(1.40)	28(1.34)	30(1.40)	30(1.46)	24(1.38)
	10^{-4}	30(1.45)	30(1.39)	30(1.35)	30(1.35)	30(1.35)	30(1.36)	30(1.40)	30(1.44)	24(1.30)
	10^{-6}	29(1.47)	29(1.43)	29(1.40)	29(1.38)	29(1.40)	29(1.38)	29(1.37)	30(1.48)	24(1.30)
	10^{-8}	23(1.28)	23(1.22)	23(1.18)	23(1.19)	23(1.17)	23(1.15)	23(1.15)	23(1.15)	22(1.24)
P-BAS	10^{-2}	20(0.94)	21(0.90)	22(0.93)	22(0.91)	22(0.93)	22(0.91)	20(0.84)	47(1.73)	50(1.86)
	10^{-4}	20(0.94)	21(0.90)	22(0.92)	22(0.92)	22(0.94)	22(0.89)	20(0.86)	47(1.76)	50(1.89)
	10^{-6}	18(0.89)	19(0.85)	20(0.87)	21(0.91)	21(0.91)	21(0.88)	22(0.91)	28(1.07)	49(1.82)
	10^{-8}	18(0.90)	19(0.84)	20(0.87)	20(0.86)	21(0.91)	22(0.93)	22(0.91)	22(0.90)	28(1.08)
P-ASSS	10^{-2}	36(1.43)	36(1.39)	36(1.36)	36(1.37)	36(1.42)	36(1.35)	38(1.43)	38(1.46)	38(1.45)
	10^{-4}	36(1.45)	36(1.39)	36(1.35)	36(1.35)	36(1.35)	36(1.36)	37(1.40)	38(1.44)	38(1.44)
	10^{-6}	37(1.47)	37(1.45)	37(1.40)	37(1.39)	37(1.40)	37(1.40)	37(1.38)	38(1.48)	38(1.43)
	10^{-8}	37(1.47)	37(1.43)	37(1.40)	37(1.40)	37(1.40)	37(1.40)	37(1.40)	37(1.39)	36(1.36)

- [2] H. Elman, D. Silvester, A.J. Wathen, Finite Elements and Fast Iterative Solvers with Applications in Incompressible Fluid Dynamics, Oxford University Press, 2005.
- [3] W. Krendl, V. Simoncini and W. Zulehner, Stability estimates and structural spectral properties of saddle point problems, Numer. Math. 124 (2013) 183–213.
- [4] Z.-R. Ren, Y. Cao, An alternating positive-semidefinite splitting preconditioner for saddle point problems from time-harmonic eddy current models, IMA J. Numer. Anal, 36 (2016) 922–946.
- [5] Y. Saad, A flexible inner-outer preconditioned GMRES algorithm, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. 14 (1993) 461–469.
- [6] D.K. Salkuyeh, A new iterative method for solving a class of two-by-two block complex linear systems, Calcolo, Accepted for publication, 2021.
- [7] Z. Zheng, G.-F. Zhang and M.-Z. Zhu, A block alternating splitting iteration method for a class of block two-by-two complex linear systems, J. Comput. Math. Appl., 288 (2015), 203–214.
- [8] Z. Zheng, G.-F. Zhang., M.-Z. Zhu, A note on preconditioners for complex linear systems arising from PDE-constrained optimization problems, Appl. Math. Lett. 61 (2016) 114–121.