Templates for Linear Algebra Problems

Zhaojun Bai
University of Kentucky
David Day
University of Kentucky
James Demmel
University of California - Berkeley
Jack Dongarra
University of Tennessee and Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Ming Gu
University of California - Berkeley
Axel Ruhe
Chalmers University of Technology, Göteborg
and
Henk van der Vorst
Utrecht University

Abstract. The increasing availability of advanced-architecture computers is having a very significant effect on all spheres of scientific computation, including algorithm research and software development in numerical linear algebra. Linear algebra –in particular, the solution of linear systems of equations and eigenvalue problems – lies at the heart of most calculations in scientific computing. This chapter discusses some of the recent developments in linear algebra designed to help the user on advanced-architecture computers.
Much of the work in developing linear algebra software for advanced-architecture computers is motivated by the need to solve large problems on the fastest computers available. In this chapter, we focus on four basic issues: (1) the motivation for the work; (2) the development of standards for use in linear algebra and the building blocks for a library; (3) aspects of templates for the solution of large sparse systems of linear algorithm; and (4) templates for the solution of large sparse eigenvalue problems. This last project is under development and we will pay more attention to it in this chapter.

1 Introduction and Motivation

Large scale problems of engineering and scientific computing often require solutions of linear algebra problems, such as systems of linear equations, least squares problems, or eigenvalue problems. There is a vast amount of material available on solving such problems, in books, in journal articles, and as software. This software consists of well-maintained libraries available commercially or electronically in the public-domain, other libraries distributed with texts or other books, individual subroutines tested and published by organizations like the ACM, and yet more software available from individuals or electronic sources like Netlib [21], which may be hard to find or come without support. So although many challenging numerical linear algebra problems still await satisfactory solutions, many excellent methods exist from a plethora of sources.

* This work was made possible in part by grants from the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency under contract DAAL03-91-C-0047 administered by the Army Research Office, the Office of Scientific Computing U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC05-84OR21400, the National Science Foundation Science and Technology Center Cooperative Agreement No. CCR-8809615, and National Science Foundation Grant No. ASC-9005933.

But the sheer number of algorithms and their implementations makes it hard even for experts, let alone general users, to find the best solution for a given problem. This has led to the development of various on-line search facilities for numerical software. One has been developed by NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology), and is called GAMS (Guide to Available Mathematical Software) [7]; another is part of Netlib [21]. These facilities permit search based on library names, subroutines names, keywords, and a taxonomy of topics in numerical computing. But for the general user in search of advice as to which algorithm or which subroutine to use for her particular problem, they offer relatively little advice.

Furthermore, many challenging problems cannot be solved with existing "black-box" software packages in a reasonable time or space. This means that more special purpose methods must be used, and tuned for the problem at hand. This tuning is the greatest challenge, since there are a large number of tuning options available, and for many problems it is a challenge to get any acceptable answer at all, or have confidence in what is computed. The expertise regarding which options, or combinations of options, is likely to work in a specific application area, is widely distributed.

Thus, there is a need for tools to help users pick the best algorithm and implementation for their numerical problems, as well as expert advice on how to tune them. In fact, we see three potential user communities for such tools:

- The "HPCC" (High Performance Computing and Communication) community consists of those scientists trying to solve the largest, hardest applications in their fields. They desire high speed, access to algorithmic details for performance tuning, and reliability for their problem.
- Engineers and scientists generally desire easy-to-use, reliable software, that is also reasonably efficient.
- Students and teachers want simple but generally effective algorithms, which are easy to explain and understand.

It may seem difficult to address the needs of such diverse communities with a single document. Nevertheless, we believe this is possible in the form of *templates*.

A template for an algorithm includes

1. A high-level description of the algorithm.
2. A description of when it is effective, including conditions on the input, and estimates of the time, space or other resources required. If there are natural competitors, they will be referenced.
3. A description of available refinements and user-tunable parameters, as well as advice on when to use them.
4. Pointers to complete or partial implementations, perhaps in several languages or for several architectures (each parallel architecture). These implementation expose those details suitable for user-tuning, and hide the others.
5. Numerical examples, on a common set of examples, illustrating both easy cases and difficult cases.
6. Trouble shooting advice.
7. Pointers to texts or journal articles for further information.

In addition to individual templates, there will be a *decision tree* to help steer the user to the right algorithm, or subset of possible algorithms, based on a sequence of questions about the nature of the problem to be solved.

Our goal in this paper is to outline such a set of templates for systems of linear equations and eigenvalue problems. The main theme is to explain how to use iterative methods.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses related work. Section 3 describes the work we have done on templates for sparse linear systems. Section 4 described our taxonomy of eigenvalue problems and algorithms, which we will use to organize the templates and design a decision tree. Section 4.1 discusses notation and terminology. Sections 4.2 through 4.7 below describe

the decision tree in more detail. Section 4.8 outlines a chapter on accuracy issues, which is meant to describe what accuracy one can expect to achieve, since eigenproblems can be very ill-conditioned, as well as tools for measuring accuracy. Section 4.9 describes the formats in which we expect to deliver both software and documentation.

This paper is a design document, and we encourage feedback, especially from potential users.

2 Related Work

Many excellent numerical linear algebra texts [43, 25, 30, 11, 33] and black-box software libraries [36, 24, 1] already exist. A great deal of more specialized software for eigenproblems also exists, for example, for surveys on the subject see [31, 4].

A book of templates, including software, has already been written for iterative methods for solving linear systems [6], although it does not include all the ingredients mentioned above. In particular, it discusses some important advanced methods, such as preconditioning, domain decomposition and multigrid, relatively briefly, and does not have a comprehensive set of numerical examples to help explain the expected performance from each algorithm on various problem classes. It has a relatively simple decision tree to help users choose an algorithm. Nevertheless, it successfully incorporates many of the features we wish to have.

The linear algebra chapter in Numerical Recipes [32] contains a brief description of the conjugate gradient algorithm for sparse linear systems and the eigensystem chapter only contains the basic method for solving dense standard eigenvalue problem, all of the methods and available software in the recipes, except the Jacobi method for symmetric eigenvalue problem, are simplified version of algorithms in the EISPACK and LAPACK. Beside on disk, the software in the recipes are actually printed line by line in the book.

2.1 Dense Linear Algebra Libraries

Over the past twenty-five years, we have been involved in the development of several important packages of dense linear algebra software: EISPACK [36, 24], LINPACK [16], LAPACK [1], and the BLAS [28, 19, 18]. In addition, we are currently involved in the development of ScaLAPACK [8], a scalable version of LAPACK for distributed memory concurrent computers. In this section, we give a brief review of these packages—their history, their advantages, and their limitations on high-performance computers.

EISPACK EISPACK is a collection of Fortran subroutines that compute the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of nine classes of matrices: complex general, complex Hermitian, real general, real symmetric, real symmetric banded, real symmetric tridiagonal, special real tridiagonal, generalized real, and generalized real symmetric matrices. In addition, two routines are included that use singular value decomposition to solve certain least-squares problems.

EISPACK is primarily based on a collection of Algol procedures developed in the 1960s and collected by J. H. Wilkinson and C. Reinsch in a volume entitled *Linear Algebra* in the *Handbook for Automatic Computation* series [44]. This volume was not designed to cover every possible method of solution; rather, algorithms were chosen on the basis of their generality, elegance, accuracy, speed, or economy of storage.

Since the release of EISPACK in 1972, thousands of copies of the collection have been distributed worldwide.

LINPACK LINPACK is a collection of Fortran subroutines that analyze and solve linear equations and linear least-squares problems. The package solves linear systems whose matrices are general,

banded, symmetric indefinite, symmetric positive definite, triangular, and tridiagonal square. In addition, the package computes the QR and singular value decompositions of rectangular matrices and applies them to least-squares problems.

LINPACK is organized around four matrix factorizations: LU factorization, Cholesky factorization, QR factorization, and singular value decomposition. The term LU factorization is used here in a very general sense to mean the factorization of a square matrix into a lower triangular part and an upper triangular part, perhaps with pivoting.

LINPACK uses column-oriented algorithms to increase efficiency by preserving locality of reference. By column orientation we mean that the LINPACK codes always reference arrays down columns, not across rows. This works because Fortran stores arrays in column major order. Thus, as one proceeds down a column of an array, the memory references proceed sequentially in memory. On the other hand, as one proceeds across a row, the memory references jump across memory, the length of the jump being proportional to the length of a column. The effects of column orientation are quite dramatic: on systems with virtual or cache memories, the LINPACK codes will significantly outperform codes that are not column oriented. We note, however, that textbook examples of matrix algorithms are seldom column oriented.

Another important factor influencing the efficiency of LINPACK is the use of the Level 1 BLAS; there are three effects.

First, the overhead entailed in calling the BLAS reduces the efficiency of the code. This reduction is negligible for large matrices, but it can be quite significant for small matrices. The matrix size at which it becomes unimportant varies from system to system; for square matrices it is typically between $n = 25$ and $n = 100$. If this seems like an unacceptably large overhead, remember that on many modern systems the solution of a system of order 25 or less is itself a negligible calculation. Nonetheless, it cannot be denied that a person whose programs depend critically on solving small matrix problems in inner loops will be better off with BLAS-less versions of the LINPACK codes. Fortunately, the BLAS can be removed from the smaller, more frequently used program in a short editing session.

Second, the BLAS improve the efficiency of programs when they are run on nonoptimizing compilers. This is because doubly subscripted array references in the inner loop of the algorithm are replaced by singly subscripted array references in the appropriate BLAS. The effect can be seen for matrices of quite small order, and for large orders the savings are quite significant.

Finally, improved efficiency can be achieved by coding a set of BLAS [18] to take advantage of the special features of the computers on which LINPACK is being run. For most computers, this simply means producing machine-language versions. However, the code can also take advantage of more exotic architectural features, such as vector operations.

Further details about the BLAS are presented in Section 2.3.

LAPACK LAPACK [14] provides routines for solving systems of linear equations, least-squares problems, eigenvalue problems, and singular value problems. The associated matrix factorizations (LU, Cholesky, QR, SVD, Schur, generalized Schur) are also provided, as are related computations such as reordering of the Schur factorizations and estimating condition numbers. Dense and banded matrices are handled, but not general sparse matrices. In all areas, similar functionality is provided for real and complex matrices, in both single and double precision.

The original goal of the LAPACK project was to make the widely used EISPACK and LINPACK libraries run efficiently on shared-memory vector and parallel processors, as well as RISC workstations. On these machines, LINPACK and EISPACK are inefficient because their memory access patterns disregard the multilayered memory hierarchies of the machines, thereby spending too much time moving data instead of doing useful floating-point operations. LAPACK addresses this problem by reorganizing the algorithms to use block matrix operations, such as matrix multiplication, in the innermost loops [3, 14]. These block operations can be optimized for each architecture to account for the memory hierarchy [2], and so provide a transportable way to achieve high efficiency on diverse

modern machines. Here we use the term "transportable" instead of "portable" because, for fastest possible performance, LAPACK requires that highly optimized block matrix operations be already implemented on each machine. In other words, the correctness of the code is portable, but high performance is not—if we limit ourselves to a single Fortran source code.

LAPACK can be regarded as a successor to LINPACK and EISPACK. It has virtually all the capabilities of these two packages and much more besides. LAPACK improves on LINPACK and EISPACK in four main respects: speed, accuracy, robustness and functionality. While LINPACK and EISPACK are based on the vector operation kernels of the Level 1 BLAS, LAPACK was designed at the outset to exploit the Level 3 BLAS —a set of specifications for Fortran subprograms that do various types of matrix multiplication and the solution of triangular systems with multiple right-hand sides. Because of the coarse granularity of the Level 3 BLAS operations, their use tends to promote high efficiency on many high-performance computers, particularly if specially coded implementations are provided by the manufacturer.

ScaLAPACK The ScaLAPACK software library extends the LAPACK library to run scalably on MIMD, distributed memory, concurrent computers [8, 9]. For such machines the memory hierarchy includes the off-processor memory of other processors, in addition to the hierarchy of registers, cache, and local memory on each processor. Like LAPACK, the ScaLAPACK routines are based on block-partitioned algorithms in order to minimize the frequency of data movement between different levels of the memory hierarchy. The fundamental building blocks of the ScaLAPACK library are distributed memory versions of the Level 2 and Level 3 BLAS, and a set of Basic Linear Algebra Communication Subprograms (BLACS) [17, 20] for communication tasks that arise frequently in parallel linear algebra computations. In the ScaLAPACK routines, all interprocessor communication occurs within the distributed BLAS and the BLACS, so the source code of the top software layer of ScaLAPACK looks very similar to that of LAPACK.

The interface for ScaLAPACK is similar to that of LAPACK, with some additional arguments passed to each routine to specify the data layout.

2.2 Target Architectures

The EISPACK and LINPACK software libraries were designed for supercomputers used in the 1970s and early 1980s, such as the CDC-7600, Cyber 205, and Cray-1. These machines featured multiple functional units pipelined for good performance [26]. The CDC-7600 was basically a high-performance scalar computer, while the Cyber 205 and Cray-1 were early vector computers.

The development of LAPACK in the late 1980s was intended to make the EISPACK and LINPACK libraries run efficiently on shared memory - vector supercomputers and RISC workstations. The ScaLAPACK software library will extend the use of LAPACK to distributed memory concurrent supercomputers.

The underlying concept of both the LAPACK and ScaLAPACK libraries is the use of block-partitioned algorithms to minimize data movement between different levels in hierarchical memory. Thus, the ideas for developing a library for dense linear algebra computations are applicable to any computer with a hierarchical memory that (1) imposes a sufficiently large startup cost on the movement of data between different levels in the hierarchy, and for which (2) the cost of a context switch is too great to make fine grain size multithreading worthwhile. Our target machines are, therefore, medium and large grain size advanced-architecture computers. These include "traditional" shared memory, vector supercomputers, such as the Cray Y-MP and C90, and MIMD distributed memory concurrent supercomputers, such as the Intel Paragon, the IBM SP2 and Cray T3D concurrent systems.

Future advances in compiler and hardware technologies in the mid to late 1990s are expected to make multithreading a viable approach for masking communication costs. Since the blocks in a

block-partitioned algorithm can be regarded as separate threads, our approach will still be applicable on machines that exploit medium and coarse grain size multithreading.

2.3 The BLAS as the Key to Portability

At least three factors affect the performance of portable Fortran code.

1. **Vectorization.** Designing vectorizable algorithms in linear algebra is usually straightforward. Indeed, for many computations there are several variants, all vectorizable, but with different characteristics in performance (see, for example, [15]). Linear algebra algorithms can approach the peak performance of many machines—principally because peak performance depends on some form of chaining of vector addition and multiplication operations, and this is just what the algorithms require. However, when the algorithms are realized in straightforward Fortran 77 code, the performance may fall well short of the expected level, usually because vectorizing Fortran compilers fail to minimize the number of memory references—that is, the number of vector load and store operations.
2. **Data movement.** What often limits the actual performance of a vector, or scalar, floating-point unit is the rate of transfer of data between different levels of memory in the machine. Examples include the transfer of vector operands in and out of vector registers, the transfer of scalar operands in and out of a high-speed scalar processor, the movement of data between main memory and a high-speed cache or local memory, paging between actual memory and disk storage in a virtual memory system, and interprocessor communication on a distributed memory concurrent computer.
3. **Parallelism.** The nested loop structure of most linear algebra algorithms offers considerable scope for loop-based parallelism. This is the principal type of parallelism that LAPACK and ScaLAPACK presently aim to exploit. On shared memory concurrent computers, this type of parallelism can sometimes be generated automatically by a compiler, but often requires the insertion of compiler directives. On distributed memory concurrent computers, data must be moved between processors. This is usually done by explicit calls to message passing routines, although parallel language extensions such as Coherent Parallel C [22] and Split-C [10] do the message passing implicitly.

The question arises, "How can we achieve sufficient control over these three factors to obtain the levels of performance that machines can offer?" The answer is through use of the BLAS.

There are now three levels of BLAS:

Level 1 BLAS [28]: for vector operations, such as $y \leftarrow \alpha x + y$
Level 2 BLAS [19]: for matrix-vector operations, such as $y \leftarrow \alpha Ax + \beta y$
Level 3 BLAS [18]: for matrix-matrix operations, such as $C \leftarrow \alpha AB + \beta C$.

Here, A, B and C are matrices, x and y are vectors, and α and β are scalars.

The Level 1 BLAS are used in LAPACK, but for convenience rather than for performance: they perform an insignificant fraction of the computation, and they cannot achieve high efficiency on most modern supercomputers.

The Level 2 BLAS can achieve near-peak performance on many vector processors, such as a single processor of a CRAY X-MP or Y-MP, or Convex C-2 machine. However, on other vector processors such as a CRAY-2 or an IBM 3090 VF, the performance of the Level 2 BLAS is limited by the rate of data movement between different levels of memory.

The Level 3 BLAS overcome this limitation. This third level of BLAS performs $O(n^3)$ floating-point operations on $O(n^2)$ data, whereas the Level 2 BLAS perform only $O(n^2)$ operations on $O(n^2)$ data. The Level 3 BLAS also allow us to exploit parallelism in a way that is transparent to the software that calls them. While the Level 2 BLAS offer some scope for exploiting parallelism, greater scope is provided by the Level 3 BLAS, as Table 1 illustrates.

Table 1. Speed in Mflop/s of Level 2 and Level 3 BLAS operations on a CRAY C90

(all matrices are of order 1000; U is upper triangular)

Number of processors:	1	2	4	8	16
Level 2: $y \leftarrow \alpha Ax + \beta y$	899	1780	3491	6783	11207
Level 3: $C \leftarrow \alpha AB + \beta C$	900	1800	3600	7199	14282
Level 2: $x \leftarrow Ux$	852	1620	3063	5554	6953
Level 3: $B \leftarrow UB$	900	1800	3574	7147	13281
Level 2: $x \leftarrow U^{-1}x$	802	1065	1452	1697	1558
Level 3: $B \leftarrow U^{-1}B$	896	1792	3578	7155	14009

3 Templates for Sparse Linear Solvers

The Templates for the solution of large sparse linear systems consists of a collection of iterative methods together with a manual for algorithmic choices, instructions, and guidelines [6]. In contrast to the dense matrix case, there is no single iterative method that can solve any given sparse linear system in reasonable time and with reasonable memory requirements. In principle, many of the described methods solve a given system in at most n iteration steps, where n is the order of the linear system. Not only does this assume exact arithmetic, also one does not want to do as many as n iteration steps for large systems. A major problem with iterative solution methods is that their speed of convergence depends on certain properties of the linear system, and these properties are often unknown in practice. This makes it difficult to make the right selection for a method. For many very large linear systems iterative systems are at this moment the only possible choice; there is hardly an alternative. Therefore, it is for engineers and scientists necessary to have a meaningful variety of iterative methods available, and this is what Templates provides. The potential user is guided into the world of iterative methods, and only a minimum of linear algebra knowledge is assumed. With the information provided in [6] the user can build high quality software at several levels of sophistication, depending on requirements and goals.

The starting point in Templates is the presentation of a selection of iteration methods in a very simple form, which closely follows the algorithmic descriptions in the original references. There is no monitoring of convergence behavior, and there are no precautions against numerical problems.

In this form the iteration schemes consist of one or two matrix vector products, a couple of inner-products and a few vector updates. The algorithms also allow for some form of preconditioning, which means that in each step a linear system $Mz = r$ has to be solved, where M has to be specified by the user. All these operations are pretty well understood, and it is easy to see how the algorithms work. Although possible numerical complications are ignored, these basic iteration Templates may be used for simple computational experiments in order to get familiarized with the basic iteration methods and their mutual differences. The user is given extensive advice in the manual on how to expand the basic codes to reliable software for practical problems.

We believe that Templates in its present form is a good move in the process of educating and helping non-experts in understanding, and in the usage of iterative methods. Since the formulation is intentionally kept simple, it reveals the algorithmic essentials, and it shows where the major computational effort is going to be spent. The Matlab codes facilitate the user to play with the algorithms for relatively small but representative linear systems on workstations or even PC's, and help to develop some feeling for the potential usefulness of each of the methods. Together with the manual the chosen formulations provide the non-expert with a low-level entrance to the field. This approach has received approval recently in some new textbooks [39, 40].

The formulations and the notations have been chosen so that differences and similarities between algorithms are easily recognized. In this respect they provide simple and easy to code algorithms, that can serve as a yardstick with which other implementations can be compared. Templates provides codes in Fortran, Matlab, and C. The codes are equivalent for each algorithm, and the only differences in outputs may be attributed to the respective computer arithmetic. This usage of Templates makes it easier to compare and to present results for iteration methods in publications. It is easier now to check results which have been obtained through these standardized codes.

As an example of how Templates is intended to function, we discuss the algorithm for the preconditioned Conjugate Gradient method for the iterative solution of the linear system $Ax = b$, with A a symmetric positive definite matrix:

Compute $r_0 = b - Ax_0$ for some initial guess $x^{(0)}$
for $i = 0, 1, 2, ...$
  solve $Mz^{(i-1)} = r^{(i-1)}$
  $\rho_{i-1} = {r^{(i-1)}}^T z^{(i-1)}$
  if $i = 1$
    $p^{(1)} = z^{(0)}$
  else
    $\beta_{i-1} = \rho_{i-1}/\rho_{i-2}$
    $p^{(i)} = z^{(i-1)} + \beta_{i-1} p^{(i-1)}$
  endif
  $q^{(i)} = Ap^{(i)}$
  $\alpha_i = \rho_{i-1}/{p^{(i)}}^T q^{(i)}$
  $x^{(i)} = x^{(i-1)} + \alpha_i p^{(i)}$
  $r^{(i)} = r^{(i-1)} - \alpha_i q^{(i)}$
  check convergence; continue if necessary
end

In order to make the code useful for a specific problem class, the user has to provide a subroutine that computes Ap, for a given vector p. In Templates such code is not specified, but the user is given instructions on how to exploit sparsity of the given matrix A [6], and by well-chosen examples it is shown how to code the matrix vector product for specific data storage formats. The following sparse matrix storage formats are discussed at some length:

1. Compressed Row Storage
2. Compressed Column Storage
3. Block Compressed Row Storage
4. Compressed Diagonal Storage
5. Jagged Diagonal Storage
6. Skyline Storage

For example, in **Compressed Row Storage** format subsequent nonzeros of the matrix rows are put in contiguous memory locations. In this case we create 3 vectors: one for the floating point nonzero entries of A (**val**), the other two with integers (**col_ind**, **row_ptr**). The **row_ptr** vector stores the locations in the **val** vector that start a row; the **col_ind** vector stores the column indexes of the elements in the **val** vector. The matrix vector product should then look like

for $i = 1, n$
  $q(i) = 0$
  for $j = row_ptr(i), row_ptr(i+1) - 1$
    $q(i) = q(i) + val(j) \times p(col_ind(j))$
  end
end

Also suggestions are supplied for coding this on parallel computers.
For some algorithms also code has to be provided that generates $A^T p$, and this is given much attention.

Similarly, the user has to provide a subroutine that solves the equation $Mz = r$ for given right-hand side r. In this respect M is called the preconditioner and the choice for an appropriate preconditioner is left to the user. The main reason for this is that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to predict what a good preconditioner might be for a given problem of which little else is known besides the fact that A is symmetric positive definite. In [6] an overview is given of possible choices and semi-code for the construction of some popular preconditioners is provided, along with instructions and examples on how to code them for certain data-storage formats. A popular preconditioner that is often used in connection with the Conjugate Gradient method is the Incomplete Cholesky preconditioner. If we write the matrix A as $A = L + D + L^T$ (L is strictly lower diagonal, D is diagonal), then a simplified form of the preconditioner can be written as $M = (L + D_C)D_C^{-1}(D_C + L^T)$, and in [6] formulas are given for the computation of the elements of the diagonal matrix D_C. Since the factor L is part of A, the coding for the preconditioner is not too complicated.

The other operations (inner-products and vector updates) in the algorithm are coded, in the Fortran codes, as BLAS operations. On most modern computers these BLAS are standard available as optimized kernels, and the user needs not to be concerned with these vector operations.

So if the user wants to have transportable code then he only needs to focus on the matrix vector product and the preconditioner. However, there is more that the user might want to reflect on. In the standard codes only a simple stopping criterion is provided, but in [6] a lengthy discussion is provided on different possible termination strategies and their merits. Templates for these strategies have not yet been provided since the better of these strategies require estimates for such quantities as $\|A\|$, or even $\|A^{-1}\|$, and we do not know about convenient algorithms for estimating these quantities (except possibly for the symmetric positive definite case). This is in contrast with dense systems, for which efficient estimators are available. As soon as a reliable estimating mechanisms for these norms become known then a template can be added.

The situation for other methods, for instance Bi-CG, may be slightly more complicated. Of course the standard template is still simple but now the user may be facing (near) break-down situations in actual computing. The solution for this problem is quite complicated, and the average user may not be expected to incorporate this easily and is referred to more professional software at this moment. A template for a cure of the break-downs would be very nice but is not planned as yet.

Also the updating for the residual vector $r^{(i)}$ and the approximate solution $x^{(i)}$ may suffer from problems due to the use of finite precision arithmetic. This may result into a vector $r^{(i)}$ that differs significantly from $b - Ax^{(i)}$, whereas these vectors should be equal in exact arithmetic. Recently, good and reliable strategies have been suggested [34], and these are easily incorporated into the present Templates.

At the moment the linear systems templates for iterative methods form a good starting point for the user for the construction of useful software modules. It is anticipated that in future updates, templates will be added for algorithmic details, such as reliable vector updating, stopping criteria, and error monitoring. It is also conceivable that templates will be provided that help the user to analyze the convergence behavior, and to help get more insight in characteristics of the given problem. Most of these aspects are now covered in the Templates book, in the form of guidelines and examples. The Templates book [6] gives an abundance of references for more background and for all kinds of relevant details.

4 Templates for Solution of Eigenvalue Problems

To guide our eigenvalue template design, we need to have a model of what the reader wants. We expect that a non-expert user confronted with an eigenvalue problem would be willing to supply

– as few facts as necessary about the operator or operators whose spectral information is desired,
– the kind of spectral information desired (including accuracy), and
– the kind of computer available to solve it (perhaps).

In return, the user would want

– the software to solve the problem,
– an estimate of how long it will take to solve, and
– a way to assess the accuracy (perhaps).

In the (likely) case that no single best algorithm exists, we expect the user would want a list of reasonable alternatives and a discussion of the tradeoffs in time, space and accuracy among them. For example, it might be reasonable to use a dense algorithm on a sparse problem if high accuracy is desired, the problem is not too large, and/or the problem is to be solved just once. Much of our effort will center on educating the user as to which facts must be supplied to make a decision. To this end we have decided to categorize available methods along five (mostly independent) axes:

1. Mathematical Properties of the Problem,
2. Desired Spectral Information,
3. Problem Representation,
4. Available Transformations, and
5. Costs (including dependence on accuracy, computer type).

Ideally, the user would supply a "coordinate" for each of these five axes, thus uniquely identifying a problem class for which we could identify a "best algorithm," software implementing it, a performance model to predict its execution time, and a method to assess the accuracy.

Realistically, only a few regions of this five-dimensional space are populated with interesting or useful algorithms, and we expect to have a more decision-tree like approach to guide the user's expectations. The next five section of this paper are organized corresponding to one possible decision tree. The first "level" of the tree distinguishes problems according to their mathematical properties. The second level asks for desired spectral information, and so on.

This is not the only way to organize the decision tree. For example, a different user may wish to specify the desired spectral information later, in order to get a list of all possible algorithms relevant to her problem. Indeed, the actual internal organization of the tree may more resemble a lattice, since the some basic algorithms will be used many times in slightly different ways. Nonetheless, we believe these five axes are a good organizational tool for us to make sure we have covered all interesting cases, or at least limit the scope of what we want in an organized way. At this point, we invite suggestions as to the scope of our proposed project, whether we have left anything important out, or included something of lesser importance. Briefly, we only want to include a problem type if there is significant demand, and exploiting its special features confers *significant* performance or accuracy advantages over using a more general purpose algorithm. We want to keep the project small enough to come out with a reference book of at most two hundred pages (or the equivalent in html) within 2 years.

4.1 Notation

Matrix Pencil: We will talk mostly about eigenproblems of the form $(A - \lambda B)x = 0$. $A - \lambda B$ is also called a *matrix pencil*. λ is an indeterminate in this latter expression, and indicates that there are two matrices which define the eigenproblem. A and B need not be square.

Eigenvalues and Eigenvectors: For almost all fixed scalar values of λ, the rank of the matrix $A - \lambda B$ will be constant. The discrete set of values of λ for which the rank of $A - \lambda B$ is lower than this constant are the *eigenvalues*. Let $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_k$ be the discrete set of eigenvalues. Some λ_i may be

infinite, in which case we really consider $\mu A - B$ with eigenvalue $\mu_i = 0$. Nonzero vectors x_i and y_i such that

$$Ax_i = \lambda_i B x_i \qquad y_i^H A = \lambda_i y_i^H B,$$

are called a *right eigenvector* and a *left eigenvector*, respectively, where A^T is the transpose of A and A^H is its conjugate-transpose. The word *eigenvector* alone will mean right eigenvector.

Since there are many kinds of eigenproblems, and associated algorithms, we propose some simple top level categories to help classify them. The ultimate decision tree presented to the reader will begin with easier concepts and questions about the eigenproblem in an attempt to classify it, and proceed to harder questions. For the purposes of this overview, we will use rather more advanced categories in order to be brief but precise. For background, see [23, 25, 12].

Regular and Singular Pencils: $A - \lambda B$ is regular if A and B are square and $det(A - \lambda B)$ is not identically zero for all λ; otherwise it is singular.
Regular pencils have well-defined sets of eigenvalues which change continuously as functions of A and B; this is a minimal requirement to be able to compute the eigenvalues accurately, in the absence of other constraints on A and B. Singular pencils have eigenvalues which can change *discontinuously* as functions of A and B; extra information about A and B, as well as special algorithms which use this information, are necessary in order to compute meaningful eigenvalues. Regular and singular pencils have correspondingly different *canonical forms* representing their spectral decompositions. The *Jordan Canonical Form* of a single matrix is the best known; the *Kronecker Canonical Form* of a singular pencil is the most general. More will be discussed in section 4.3 below.

Self-adjoint and Non-self-adjoint Eigenproblems: We abuse notation to avoid confusion with the very similar but less general notions of Hermitian and non-Hermitian: We call an eigenproblem $A - \lambda B$ is *self-adjoint* if 1) A and B are both Hermitian, and 2) there is a nonsingular X such that $XAX^H = \Lambda_A$ and $XBX^H = \Lambda_B$ are real and diagonal. Thus the finite eigenvalues are real, all elementary divisors are linear, and the only possible singular blocks in the Kronecker Canonical Form represent a common null space of A and B. The primary source of self-adjoint eigenproblems is eigenvalue problems in which B is known to be positive definite; in this case $A - \lambda B$ is called a *definite pencil*. These properties lead to generally simpler and more accurate algorithms. We classify the singular value decomposition (SVD) and its generalizations as self-adjoint, because of the relationship between the SVD of A and the eigendecomposition of the Hermitian matrix $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ A^H & 0 \end{bmatrix}$.

It is sometimes possible to change the classification of an eigenproblem by simple transformations. For example, multiplying a skew-Hermitian matrix A (i.e., $A^H = -A$) by the constant $\sqrt{-1}$ makes it Hermitian, so its eigenproblem becomes self-adjoint. Such simple transformations are very useful in finding the best algorithm for a problem.

Many other definition and notation will be introduced in section 4.3.

4.2 `Level 1 of Decision Tree` Mathematical Properties

We will first list what we plan to include in the first round of the project, and then what we plan *not* to include.

What we plan to include The following description is very terse. The user will see a more extended description of each problem, including common synonyms.

1. Hermitian eigenproblem $A - \lambda I$

2. Non-Hermitian eigenproblem $A - \lambda I$
3. Generalized definite eigenproblem $A - \lambda B$, where $A = A^H$, $B = B^H > 0$
4. Generalized Hermitian eigenproblem $A - \lambda B$, where $A = A^H$, $B = B^H$
5. Generalized non-Hermitian eigenproblem $A - \lambda B$, where $B = B^H > 0$
6. Generalized non-Hermitian Eigenproblem $A - \lambda B$
7. Quadratic $\lambda^2 A + \lambda B + C$ or higher degree $\Sigma \lambda^i A_i$ eigenvalue problems
8. Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) of a single general matrix A
9. Generalized SVD of A and B
10. Other eigenvalue problems

Note that this list does include all the possible variations hinted at in the previous section; these will appear as the user traverses the tree. For example, there will be cross references to other, better algorithms in cases for which simple transformations permit their use. Here are some examples:

- Under "Hermitian eigenproblem $A - \lambda I$": If $A = BB^H$, the user will be advised to consider the SVD of B.
- Under "Generalized Hermitian eigenproblem": If $A = A^H$ and $B = B^H$, and the user knows real constants α and β such that $\alpha A + \beta B$ is positive definite, the user will be advised to consider the definite eigenproblem $A - \lambda(\alpha A + \beta B)$.
- Under "Non-Hermitian eigenproblem $A - \lambda I$": If $B = \alpha SAS^{-1}$ is Hermitian for known, simple α and S, the user will be advised to consider the eigenproblem for B.
- Under "SVD of A": If $A = BC^{-1}$, the user will be advised to consider the quotient SVD of B and C.
- Under "Quadratic $\lambda^2 A + \lambda B + C$ or higher degree $\Sigma \lambda^i A_i$ eigenvalue problems", the user will be advised to consider the linearization of problem to a matrix pencil eigenvalue problem.
- Under "Other eigenvalue problems", the user will see some other related eigenvalue problems, such as
  - Updating eigendecompositions
  - Polynomial zero finding
  - Rank revealing QR decomposition

What we plan not to include Some of them we may include, provided there is sufficient demand. Mostly, we would limit ourselves to literature references.

- There is a variety of "non-linear" eigenproblems which can be linearized in various ways and converted to the above problems
  1. Rational problems $A(\lambda)$
  2. General nonlinear problems $A(\lambda)$
  3. Polynomial system zero finding
- The SVD can be used to solve a variety of least squares problems, and these may best be solved by representing the SVD in "factored" form. These factored SVD algorithms are somewhat complicated and hard to motivate without the least squares application, but there are a great many least squares problems, but including too many of them (beyond references to the literature) would greatly expand the scope of this project. The same comments apply to the generalized SVD, of which there are even more variations.
- Eigenproblems from systems and control. There is a large source of eigenproblems, many of which can be reduced to finding certain kinds of spectral information about possibly singular pencils $A - \lambda B$. These problems arise with many kinds of special structures, many of which have been exploited in special packages, some of them can be solved by general algorithms. For example, solutions of Riccati equations are often reduced to eigenproblems. A comprehensive treatment of these problems would greatly expand the scope of the book, but including some treatment seems important.

- Structured singular value problems, also called μ-analysis by its practitioners These problems must generally be solved by optimization techniques, and indeed NP-completeness results exist for some of them. We believe that the algorithms in our proposed book would be called within inner loops for these optimization algorithms, and we should simply refer to the literature for this application. The same comment applies for other optimization problems based on eigenvalues (e.g. finding the nearest unstable matrix).
- Generalized singular value decompositions of more than two matrices
- Computing matrix functions like $\exp(A)$ or $\exp(A)x$, or for multivariate eigenvalue problems $A(\lambda, \mu)$, whose solutions are typically continua.

4.3 `Level 2 of Decision Tree` Desired Spectral Information

For each eigenproblem, the user must choose which spectral information is desired. The available choices differ depending on the mathematical properties of the problem. In general, the more information the user desires, the more it will cost.

Self-adjoint Eigenproblems We first consider the n-by-n Hermitian matrix A, which has n real eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_n$. When computing eigenvalues, the following choices are possible:

1. All the eigenvalues, to some specified accuracy.
2. Eigenvalues λ_i for some specified set of subscripts $i \in \mathcal{I}$, including the special cases of the largest m eigenvalues λ_{n-m+1} through λ_n, and the smallest m eigenvalues λ_1 through λ_m. Again, the desired accuracy may be specified.
3. All the eigenvalues within a given subset of the real axis, such as the interval $[\alpha, \beta]$. Again, the desired accuracy may be specified.
4. Certain number of eigenvalues closest to a given value μ.

For each of these possibilities, the user can also compute the corresponding eigenvectors (in this case left and right eigenvectors are equal). For the eigenvalues that are clustered together, the user may choose to compute the associated *invariant subspace*, i.e. the space spanned by the corresponding eigenvectors, since in this case the individual eigenvectors can be very ill-conditioned, while the invariant subspace may be less so.

The spectral information one can request from a singular value decomposition is similar, except that there are left and right singular vectors and singular subspaces, corresponding to eigenvectors and invariant subspaces. Common requests might include the numerical rank, the null space, and the range space. In order to compute these the user must supply a tolerance $\tau > 0$, which will determine which singular values are considered to be nonzero or zero. Methods can differ greatly depending on whether there is a gap between the singular values larger than τ and those smaller, and whether the user wants an approximate or precise answer.

Self-adjoint matrix pencils $A - \lambda B$, where A and B are n-by-n and Hermitian, and can be simultaneously diagonalized by a congruence, are quite similar. The case $B = I$ corresponds to the standard Hermitian eigenproblem just discussed. $A - \lambda B$ has $k \leq n$ real eigenvalues which we denote $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_k$. If B is nonsingular, $k = n$. The user may request similar subsets of eigenvalues as described above, as well as right and/or left eigenvectors. If the pencil is non-singular, the user may request *right or left deflating subspaces*, which are generalizations of invariant subspaces [37]. If $A - \lambda B$ is a singular pencil, the common null-space of A and B can also be computed, as well as the deflating subspaces of the regular part.

Just as the SVD of A is closely related to the eigendecomposition of $A^H A$, the QSVD corresponds to the matrix pencil $A^H A - \lambda B^H B$. The case $B = I$ corresponds to the usual SVD.

Table 2 spells out the possible decompositions which display all the information the user could want. We use terminology which will apply to the non-Hermitian problem too. "Schur" form refers

to the simplest decomposition possible with complex unitary transformations. (Real orthogonal matrices are also possible, if the original data is real; we leave out the real case for ease of exposition.) "Jordan-Schur" form refers to the most detailed decomposition possible with unitary transformations; this form reduces the matrix or matrices to "staircase" form [41], wherein all the sizes of Jordan blocks are immediately available, and some more detailed invariant (or deflating [37] or reducing [42]) subspaces are computed. "Jordan" form, which typically requires non-unitary transformations and so can be very ill-conditioned to compute, is the most detailed decomposition. Jordan form is usually called Weierstrass form for regular pencils, and Kronecker form for singular pencils. Q and Z matrices in the table are unitary, S matrices are general nonsingular, Λ is real and diagonal, Σ is real, diagonal, and nonnegative, T matrices are upper triangular, and T_S matrices are in upper triangular staircase form.

The decompositions may also be written with A and B isolated on the left-hand-side, for example $A = Q\Lambda Q^H$ instead of $Q^H AQ = \Lambda$. The reason for writing these decompositions as they are shown, is that they can be *partial decompositions*, if only $k < n$ of the eigenvalues or singular values are of interest to the user. In this case the central matrices (Λ, Λ_A, Λ_B Σ, Σ_A, Σ_B T_A, T_B, $T_{S,A}$, and T_{S_B}) will be k-by-k, and the outer matrices (Q, Z and S) will be n-by-k.

Table 2. The Possible "Eigendecompositions" of Self-adjoint Eigenproblems

Problem Type	"Schur"	"Jordan-Schur"	"Jordan"
$A - \lambda I$	$Q^H AQ = \Lambda$	same as Schur	same as Schur
$A - \lambda B$	$Q^H AZ = T_A$ $Q^H BZ = T_B$	$Q^H AZ = T_{S,A}$ $Q^H BZ = T_{S,B}$	$S^H AS = \Lambda_A$ $S^H BS = \Lambda_B$
SVD of A	$Q^H AZ = \Sigma$	same as Schur	same as Schur
QSVD of A, B	$Q^H AS = \Sigma_A$ $Z^H BS = \Sigma_B$	same as Schur same as Schur	same as Schur same as Schur

In addition to these decompositions, the user may request *condition numbers* for any of the computed quantities (eigenvalues, means of eigenvalue clusters, eigenvectors, invariant/deflating/reducing subspaces) [27, 38, 13]. Given computed values for eigenvalues, eigenvectors, and/or subspaces, the user may also request an *a posteriori* error bound based on a computed residual.

Non-self-adjoint Eigenproblems An n-by-n non-Hermitian matrix has n eigenvalues, which can be anywhere in the complex plane. A non-self-adjoint regular pencil has from 0 to n eigenvalues, which can be anywhere in the extended complex plane. Thus some of the choices in the self-adjoint case do not apply here. Instead, the following choices of spectral information are possible:

1. All the eigenvalues.
2. All the eigenvalues in some specified region of the complex plane, such as
   - The peripheral eigenvalues (when the spectrum is seen as a set in the complex plane), such as the 10 rightmost eigenvalues.
   - Eigenvalues in a given compact region, such as the unit disk.
   - Eigenvalues in a given unbounded region, such as the left half plane, or (a region around) the imaginary axis.

As before, the desired accuracy of the eigenvalues may be specified. For each of these choices, the user can also compute the corresponding (left or right) eigenvectors, or Schur vectors. Since the eigenvalues of a non-Hermitian matrix can be very ill-conditioned, it is sometimes hard to find all

eigenvalues within a given region with certainty. For eigenvalues that are clustered together, the user may choose to estimate the mean of the cluster, or even the ϵ-*pseudospectrum*, the smallest region in the complex plane which contains all the eigenvalues of all matrices B differing from the given matrix A by at most ϵ: $\|A - B\| \leq \epsilon$. The user may also choose to compute the associated invariant (or deflating or reducing) subspaces (left or right) instead of individual eigenvectors. However, due to the potential ill-conditioning of the eigenvalues, there is no guarantee that the invariant subspace will be well-conditioned.

A singular pencil has a more complicated eigenstructure, as defined by the Kronecker Canonical Form, a generalization of the Jordan Canonical Form [23, 41]. Instead of invariant or deflating subspaces, we say a singular pencil has reducing subspaces.

Table 3 spells out the possibilities. In addition to the notation used in the last section, U matrices denote generalized upper triangular (singular pencils only), U_S matrices are generalized upper triangular in staircase form (singular pencils only), J is in Jordan form, and K is in Kronecker form. As before, these can be partial decompositions, when Q, Z, S_L and S_R are n-by-k instead of n-by-n.

Table 3. The Possible "Eigendecompositions" of Non-self-adjoint Eigenproblems

Problem Type	"Schur"	"Jordan-Schur"	"Jordan"
$A - \lambda I$	$Q^H A Q = T$	$Q^H A Q = T_S$	$S^{-1} A S = J$
$A - \lambda B$, regular	$Q^H A Z = T_A$	$Q^H A Z = T_{S,A}$	$S_L^{-1} A S_R = J_A$
	$Q^H B Z = T_B$	$Q^H B Z = T_{S,B}$	$S_L^{-1} B S_R = J_B$
$A - \lambda B$, singular	$Q^H A Z = U_A$	$Q^H A Z = U_{S,A}$	$S_L^{-1} A S_R = K_A$
	$Q^H B Z = U_B$	$Q^H B Z = U_{S,B}$	$S_L^{-1} B S_R = K_B$

In addition to these decompositions, the user may request condition numbers for any of the computed quantities (eigenvalues, means of eigenvalue clusters, eigenvectors, invariant/deflating/reducing subspaces). Given computed values for eigenvalues, eigenvectors, and/or subspaces, the user may also request an a posteriori error bound based on a computed residual.

4.4 `Level 3 of Decision Tree` Problem Representation

First we discuss the *type* of individual matrix or operator entries. The simplest distinction is between *real* and *complex* data. The issues are speed (real arithmetic is faster than complex), storage (real numbers require half the storage of complex numbers), code complexity (some algorithms simplify greatly if we can do complex arithmetic), and stability (real arithmetic can guarantee complex conjugate eigenvalues of real matrices). The distinction between *single* and *double* precision, which clearly affects space, will be discussed again as an accuracy issue.

Given the type of individual operator entries, we must distinguish the overall structure of the operator. Here is our list. Two letter abbreviations (like GE) refer to matrix types supported by LAPACK [1, Table 2.1].

- Dense matrices
  - General (GE)
  - Hermitian, with only upper or lower half defined (SY or HE)
  - Hermitian, packed into half the space (SP or HP)
- Matrices depending systematically on $O(n)$ data.
  - Band matrices
    - Bidiagonal matrices, stored as two arrays (BD)

    - Tridiagonal matrices, stored as two or three arrays (ST, GT)
    - Wider band matrices (GB, SB, HB)
    - Band matrices with bulges ("look ahead" matrices)
  - Arrow, Toeplitz, Hankel, Circulant, and Companion matrices
  - Diagonal + rank-1 matrices, band + low rank matrices
- Sparse matrices, or those depending less systematically on $o(n^2)$ data. It turns out that the relevant classification is by the operations that can be performed on the operators represented, not the details of the representation. This will be clearer in Section 4.5.
  - can solve the linear system $(A - \mu B)x = b$
  - Matrix-vector multiplication possible $y = Ax$ (and $y = A^H x$) (this includes, for example, "dense" integral operators which have fast algorithms for performing $y = Ax$.)
  - under SVD or GSVD, possible to factor $AA^H - \lambda BB^H$ or $A^H A - \lambda B^H B$, or $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ A^H & 0 \end{bmatrix} - \lambda \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & B^H B \end{bmatrix}$, perhaps shifted

There are many more special structures, often arising from control theory, such as unitary orthogonal matrices represented by their Schur parameters. Until we hear of a large demand for such problems, we do not plan to include them, other than as literature references. For the same reason we also do not plan to include algorithms for quaternion matrices, or matrices with rational entries, which are more properly included in the domain of symbolic computation.

4.5 `Level 4 of Decision Tree` Available Operations

The choice between different methods very much depends on which of these operations one has available at a reasonable cost. We list the major ones in decreasing order of power:

- For those methods, which do not generally require user tuning for accuracy and reliability and has predictable cost and performance.
  - Some special matrices, such as bidiagonals or diagonal + rank-1 matrices, have special algorithms designed especially for them. Many good implementations are available [1].
  - Similarity transformations $S^{-1}AS$ can be applied to matrices A of reasonable size, stored as two dimensional arrays, or in a dense band structure. (For pencils $A - \lambda B$, we would use equivalence transformations $S_L^{-1} A S_R - \lambda S_L^{-1} B S_R$ instead). Many of these algorithms have good implementations available [1]. Some of them (such as sign function based algorithms [5]) are currently being implemented. When good "black-box" implementations exist, they will not be described in detailed templates. We will however indicate when they are to be preferred over the iterative methods, which are the main theme of this collection.
- For those methods, which generally require user tuning
  - Multiplication of a vector x by a shifted-and-inverted operator, $y = (A - \mu I)^{-1} x$ or $y = (A - \mu B)^{-1} B x$ for a given vector x, lets us quickly compute the eigenvalues closest to the shift μ. This operation may be implemented with an explicit triangular factorization

    $$A - \mu B = PLU$$

    e.g. as a part of an FEM (finite element method) package, but any other implementation may also be used, such as those based on multigrid or more specialized methods. It is also possible to use an iterative solver which only uses multiplication by A (or A and B) internally, but this may not be superior to other methods discussed below.
  - If the shift μ is restricted, say to 0, then we will be restricted to efficiently finding eigenvalues closest to zero, and will need more iterations to find any but the few smallest eigenvalues.

- If only B is factorizable, e.g. if $B = I$, so that we can only multiply vectors by AB^{-1}, we will be restricted to efficiently finding the *peripheral* eigenvalues, i.e. those eigenvalues near the "edges" of the spectrum, when the spectrum is seen as a set in the complex plane.

If, in a special purpose method, it is possible to multiply a vector by A^H in addition to A, or possibly $y = (A - \mu I)^{-H}x$ or $y = B^H(A - \mu B)^{-H}x$, depending on the situation, then a broader, more powerful class of algorithms are available.

Sometimes it is significantly cheaper to apply the operator to a set of vectors rather than just 1 vector at a time. This can happen because of memory hierarchy effects. There are algorithms to exploit this behavior.

The worst case is when the only operation we can perform is multiplication of a vector by A (and possibly B). But algorithms are available in this case too.

Not only the matrix-vector operations but also the vector algebra needs special consideration. In all the algorithms that we will consider, only two different vector operations have to be applied to vectors of length n, dot products and the addition of a multiple of one vector to another, `axpy` to use terminology from the BLAS. These operations may be implemented on distributed processors in a way that is appropriate for the application or the computer at hand. In some cases a vector is not even represented as an array of numbers, but stands for a function represented in e.g. a finite element or wavelet basis. Then user-supplied routines for dot products and axpy will replace the basic vector operations in our templates.

4.6 Basic Iterative Algorithms

The following basic algorithms for sparse eigenproblems will be included.

- Simultaneous iteration methods
- Arnoldi methods
- Lanczos methods
- Davidson methods
- Refinement methods
- Trace minimization (self-adjoint case only)

This list is not exhaustive, and we are actively looking for other algorithms. Also, some common methods may classified in several ways. For example, simultaneous iteration and block Arnoldi with an immediate restart are identical. These categories are not meant to be mutually exclusive, but to be helpful to the user. We will include some older but commonly used methods, just to be able to advise the user to use more powerful alternatives, and for experimental purposes.

Arnoldi and Lanczos methods are Krylov subspaces based techniques. These methods may converge very fast in combination with shifted-and-inverted operators, which means that $(A-\mu I)^{-1}$ has to be used in matrix vector products in each iteration step. If only approximations for $(A - \mu I)^{-1}$ are available then Davidson's method can be used as an acceleration technique for the inexact shift-and-invert operations. Approximations for $(A - \mu I)^{-1}$ can be computed from a preconditioner for $A - \mu I$ or by a few steps of a (preconditioned) iterative method [35].

Trace minimization is suitable for self-adjoint problems, and uses optimization techniques like conjugate gradients to find the k smallest eigenvalues.

There is unfortunately no simple way to identify the best algorithm and choice of options to the user. The more the user discovers about the problem (such as approximate eigenvalues), the better a choice can be made. In the common situation where the user is solving a sequence of similar problems, this is quite important.

There is also unfortunately no inexpensive way to provide a guarantee that all eigenvalues in a region have been found, when the problem is not self-adjoint. For Hermitian eigenvalue problems by factoring certain translations of A by the identity, it is possible to guarantee that all eigenvalues in a

region have been found. In the non-Hermitian case, this same task is accomplished by a vastly more expensive technique called a Nyquist plot (i.e. compute the winding number). However, depending on the problem, there are methods to help increase one's confidence that all eigenvalues have been found.

4.7 Cost Issues

As stated above, the user would ideally like a simple formula, or perhaps a program, that would predict the running time as a function of a few simple facts about the problem to be solved, and the computer to be used to solve it. This implies that we need to build performance models for all the algorithms we provide. Realistically, for some dense algorithms we will be able to give operation counts, dependent on the size and mathematical properties of the problem to be solved, the information desired by the user, and perhaps some rough properties of the operator, like the clustering of the spectrum. For sparse problems, we can do the same for the inner loop of the iteration, counting operations like matrix-factorizations, matrix-vector multiplies, dot products, saxpys, and so on.

For particular machines, we can provide Matlab scripts to actually estimate running times in terms of a few machine parameters, like megaflop rate (for the 3 levels of BLAS), number of processors and communication costs (for parallel machines), matrix dimension, layout (on parallel machines), information desired by the user, and so on. There are two basic approaches to producing such performance models (hybrids are possible too). The first is *intrinsic*, which uses operation counts plus simpler models for the costs of each operation (BLAS operations and communication), and the second is *extrinsic*, which simply does curve fitting of benchmark runs. Intrinsic models are more difficult to produce, may be less accurate in certain extreme cases, but are more flexible and illuminating than extrinsic models.

4.8 Accuracy Issues

As usual in numerical linear algebra, we will use the backward error analysis model to assess the accuracy of the results. We will first give perturbation theorems that tell how much a perturbation of the data, in this case matrix elements, will change the results, eigenvalues, singular values and vectors. We will also provide a posteriori methods to measure the backward error for computed solutions.

In the simplest cases, the perturbation theorems give a bound for the perturbation of the eigenvalues as a multiple of the perturbation of the matrix elements. The multiplier is called a *condition number*. For eigenvectors we also need information about the distance between the different eigenvalues, as well as the angles between left and right eigenvectors. In degenerate cases, the best we can get is an asymptotic series, possibly involving fractional powers of the perturbation.

We will discuss what to do when a simple condition number based bound is not practical. If we do not have good bounds for individual eigenvectors, then a better conditioned invariant (or deflating or reducing) subspace of higher dimension may be available. We can also derive a bound for the norm of the resolvent and find *pseudospectra*.

For iterative algorithms *a posteriori* methods are used to compute the backward error, often using computed residuals. It is possible to compute, or at least estimate, the residual during the computation as part of monitoring for convergence.

We will show when stronger results as e.g. small relative error bounds for small eigenvalues exist. This is of importance, specially when an ill conditioned matrix comes from the discretization of a well conditioned continuous problem.

4.9 Format of Results

As stated at the beginning of Section 4, the user would ideally want to be asked a few questions about his or her problem, and in return get summary of the right algorithm to use, a pointer to

corresponding software, and performance and accuracy predictions. In addition to the conventional book format in which such information could be presented, we plan to explore the use of a hypertext interface to let the user browse through the information, and traverse the underlying decision tree. Both "black boxes" as in LAPACK and "templates" will be possible recommendations at the bottom of the decision tree. Black boxes will be briefly described, but not in sufficient detail to reproduce a good implementation (which is why they are black boxes!). Templates will be made available in pseudocode, Matlab, and Fortran, as they were in the prior Templates book. If there is strong feeling that C, C++, or Fortran 90 should also be used, we would like to hear it (but note that we do not have the resources to recode LAPACK in Fortran-90 or C++, although wrappers are possible). We hope to assemble a set of test cases, and evaluate the algorithms we suggest on these test cases. The test cases should demonstrate both typical and extreme behaviors of the algorithms.

References

1. E. Anderson, Z. Bai, C. Bischof, J. Demmel, J. Dongarra, J. Du Croz, A. Greenbaum, S. Hammarling, A. McKenney, S. Ostrouchov, and D. Sorensen. *LAPACK Users' Guide, Release 2.0.* SIAM, Philadelphia, 1995. 324 pages. URL http://www.netlib.org/lapack/lug/lapack_lug.html.
2. E. Anderson and J. Dongarra. Results from the initial release of LAPACK. Technical Report LAPACK working note 16, Computer Science Department, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, 1989.
3. E. Anderson and J. Dongarra. Evaluating block algorithm variants in LAPACK. Technical Report LAPACK working note 19, Computer Science Department, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, 1990.
4. Z. Bai. Progress in the numerical solution of the nonsymmetric eigenvalue problem, 1993. To appear in *J. Num. Lin. Alg. Appl.*
5. Z. Bai and J. Demmel. Design of a parallel nonsymmetric eigenroutine toolbox, Part I. In *Proceedings of the Sixth SIAM Conference on Parallel Proceeding for Scientific Computing.* SIAM, 1993. Long version available as UC Berkeley Computer Science report all.ps.Z via anonymous ftp from tr-ftp.cs.berkeley.edu, directory pub/tech-reports/csd/csd-92-718.
6. R. Barrett, M. Berry, T. Chan, J. Demmel, J. Donato, J. Dongarra, V. Eijkhout, V. Pozo, Romime C., and H. van der Vorst. *Templates for the solution of linear systems: Building blocks for iterative methods.* SIAM, 1994. URL http://www.netlib.org/templates/templates.ps.
7. R. Boisvert. The architecture of an intelligent virtual mathematical software repository system. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, 36:269–279, 1994.
8. J. Choi, J. J. Dongarra, R. Pozo, and D. W. Walker. ScaLAPACK: A scalable linear algebra library for distributed memory concurrent computers. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Symposium on the Frontiers of Massively Parallel Computation*, pages 120–127. IEEE Computer Society Press, 1992.
9. J. Choi, J. J. Dongarra, and D. W. Walker. The design of scalable software libraries for distributed memory concurrent computers. In J. J. Dongarra and B. Tourancheau, editors, *Environments and Tools for Parallel Scientific Computing.* Elsevier Science Publishers, 1993.
10. D. E. Culler, A. Dusseau, S. C. Goldstein, A. Krishnamurthy, S. Lumetta, T. von Eicken, and K. Yelick. Introduction to Split-C: Version 0.9. Technical report, Computer Science Division – EECS, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, February 1993.
11. J. Cullum and R. A. Willoughby. *Lanczos algorithms for large symmetric eigenvalue computations.* Birkhaüser, Basel, 1985. Vol.1, Theory, Vol.2. Program.
12. J. Demmel. Berkeley Lecture Notes in Numerical Linear Algebra. Mathematics Department, University of California, 1993. 215 pages.
13. J. Demmel and B. Kågström. The generalized Schur decomposition of an arbitrary pencil $A - \lambda B$: Robust software with error bounds and applications. Parts I and II. *ACM Trans. Math. Soft.*, 19(2), June 1993.
14. J. Demmel. LAPACK: A portable linear algebra library for supercomputers. In *Proceedings of the 1989 IEEE Control Systems Society Workshop on Computer-Aided Control System Design*, December 1989.
15. J. J. Dongarra. Increasing the performance of mathematical software through high-level modularity. In *Proc. Sixth Int. Symp. Comp. Methods in Eng. & Applied Sciences, Versailles, France*, pages 239–248. North-Holland, 1984.
16. J. J. Dongarra, J. R. Bunch, C. B. Moler and G. W. Stewart. LINPACK Users' Guide. SIAM Press, 1979.
17. J. J. Dongarra. LAPACK Working Note 34: Workshop on the BLACS. Computer Science Dept. Technical Report CS-91-134, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, May 1991.
18. J. J. Dongarra, J. Du Croz, S. Hammarling, and I. Duff. A set of level 3 basic linear algebra subprograms. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software*, 16(1):1–17, 1990.
19. J. J. Dongarra, J. Du Croz, S. Hammarling, and R. Hanson. An extended set of Fortran basic linear algebra subroutines. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software*, 14(1):1–17, March 1988.
20. J. J. Dongarra and R. A. van de Geijn. LAPACK Working Note 37: Two-dimensional basic linear algebra communication subprograms. Computer Science Department, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, October 1991.
21. J. Dongarra and E. Grosse. Distribution of mathematical software via electronic mail. *Communications of the ACM*, 30(5):403–407, July 1987. URL http://www.netlib.org/.

22. E. W. Felten and S. W. Otto. Coherent parallel C. In G. C. Fox, editor, *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Hypercube Concurrent Computers and Applications*, pages 440–450. ACM Press, 1988.
23. F. Gantmacher. *The Theory of Matrices, Vol. II (transl.)*. Chelsea, New York, 1959.
24. B. S. Garbow, J. M. Boyle, J. J. Dongarra, and C. B. Moler. *Matrix Eigensystem Routines – EISPACK Guide Extension*, Volume 51 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977.
25. G. Golub and C. Van Loan. *Matrix Computations*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, 2nd edition, 1989.
26. R. W. Hockney and C. R. Jesshope. *Parallel Computers*. Adam Hilger Ltd., Bristol, UK, 1981.
27. T. Kato. *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*. Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2 edition, 1980.
28. C. Lawson, R. Hanson, D. Kincaid, and F. Krogh. Basic Linear Algebra Subprograms for Fortran usage. *ACM Trans. Math. Soft.*, 5:308–323, 1979.
29. A. Packard, M. Fan, and J. Doyle. A power method for the structured singular value. In *IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, pages 2132–2137, 1988.
30. B. Parlett. *The Symmetric Eigenvalue Problem*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1980.
31. B. Parlett. The software scene in the extraction of eigenvalues from sparse matrices. *SIAM J. Sci. Stat. Comp.*, 5:590–604, 1984.
32. W.H. Press, B.P. Flannery, S.A. Teukolsky, and W.T. Vetterling. *Numerical Recipes in C*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1991.
33. Y. Saad. *Numerical methods for large eigenvalue problems*. Manchester University Press, 1992.
34. G. Sleijpen and H. van der Vorst. Reliable updated residuals in hybrid Bi-CG methods. Preprint 886, Utrecht University, the Netherlands, 1994. to appear in Computing.
35. G. Sleijpen and H. van der Vorst. A Jacobi-Davidson iteration method for linear eigenvalue problems. Preprint 856 (revised), Utrecht University, the Netherlands, 1995 . to appear in SIMAX.
36. B. T. Smith, J. M. Boyle, J. J. Dongarra, B. S. Garbow, Y. Ikebe, V. C. Klema, and C. B. Moler. *Matrix Eigensystem Routines – EISPACK Guide*, Volume 6 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976.
37. G. W. Stewart. Error and perturbation bounds for subspaces associated with certain eigenvalue problems. *SIAM Review*, 15(4):727–764, Oct 1973.
38. G. W. Stewart and J.-G. Sun. *Matrix Perturbation Theory*. Academic Press, New York, 1990.
39. C. Überhuber. Computer-Numerik, Part 1 and 2, Springer Verlag, Berlin, etc, 1995.
40. A.J. van der Steen (ed). Aspects of Computational Science. NCF, Den Haag, the Netherlands, 1995.
41. P. Van Dooren. The computation of Kronecker's canonical form of a singular pencil. *Lin. Alg. Appl.*, 27:103–141, 1979.
42. P. Van Dooren. Reducing subspaces: Definitions, properties and algorithms. In B. Kågström and A. Ruhe, editors, *Matrix Pencils*, pages 58–73. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 973, Proceedings, Pite Havsbad, 1982.
43. J. H. Wilkinson. *The Algebraic Eigenvalue Problem*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1965.
44. J. Wilkinson and C. Reinsch. *Handbook for Automatic Computation: Volume II - Linear Algebra*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971.
45. P. Young, M. Newlin, and J. Doyle. Practical computation of the mixed μ problem. In *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*, pages 2190–2194, 1994.

This article was processed using the LaTeX macro package with LLNCS style