EXISTENCE AND UNIQUENESS OF SPLITTINGS FOR STATIONARY ITERATIVE METHODS WITH APPLICATIONS TO ALTERNATING METHODS

Michele Benzi and Daniel B. Szyld

Report 95-81
August 1995

This report is available in the World Wide Web at `http://www.math.temple.edu/~szyld` or via anonymous ftp at `ftp.math.temple.edu` in directory `pub/szyld`.

EXISTENCE AND UNIQUENESS OF SPLITTINGS FOR STATIONARY ITERATIVE METHODS WITH APPLICATIONS TO ALTERNATING METHODS

MICHELE BENZI* AND DANIEL B. SZYLD†

Abstract. Given a nonsingular matrix A, and a nonnegative matrix T, under certain very mild conditions, there is a unique splitting $A = B - C$, such that $T = B^{-1}C$. Moreover, all properties of the splitting are derived directly from the iteration matrix T. These results do not hold when the matrix A is singular. It is shown that given a nonnegative matrix T and a splitting $A = B - C$ such that $T = B^{-1}C$, there are infinitely many other splittings corresponding to the same matrices A and T. Furthermore, some of these splittings can be regular splittings, while others can be only weak splittings. Analogous results hold in the symmetric positive semidefinite case. Given a singular matrix A, not for all iteration matrices T there is a splitting corresponding to them. Necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of such splittings are given. As an illustration of the theory developed, the convergence of certain alternating iterations is analyzed. Different cases where the matrix is monotone, singular, and positive (semi)definite are studied.

Key words. Iterative methods, linear systems, singular matrices, (semi)positive definite matrices, splittings, alternating methods.

AMS(MOS) subject classification. 65F10, 15A06.

1. Introduction and Preliminaries.

Let A be a square matrix, possibly singular. The representation $A = B - C$ is called a splitting if B is nonsingular. Consider the solution of linear systems of the form

$$Ax = b. \tag{1}$$

---

* Dipartimento di Matematica, Universitá di Bologna, Piazza di Porta San Donato, 5, 40127 Bologna, Italy (benzi@dm.unibo.it)

† Department of Mathematics, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122-2585, USA (szyld@math.temple.edu). This work was supported by the National Science Foundation grant DMS-9201728.

A splitting gives rise to the classical iterative method

$$x^{k+1} = Tx^k + c, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots, \tag{2}$$

where $T = B^{-1}C$ is called the iteration matrix of the method, $c = B^{-1}b$, and x^0 is given as the initial guess. We denote by $T \geq 0$ a nonnegative matrix, i.e., a matrix with nonnegative entries, by $\sigma(T)$ the spectrum of T, and by $\rho(T)$ its spectral radius.

It is well-known that the convergence of the method (2), i.e., of the sequence $\{x^k\}$, depends on the convergence of the sequence T^k as $k \to \infty$; see, e.g., [9], [43], [52], [54]. Following [36] and other authors, we say that T is *convergent* if the powers T^k converge to a limiting matrix as $k \to \infty$. If that limit is the zero matrix, T is called *zero-convergent*. As is well-known, for A nonsingular a necessary and sufficient condition for the convergence of (2) is that T be zero-convergent, or, equivalently, that $\rho(T) < 1$. In the singular case the situation is more involved; see, e.g., [9], [29], [48]. In this case, $1 \in \sigma(T)$ and a necessary condition for convergence is that $\rho(T) = 1$ be the only eigenvalue in the unit circle, i.e., that $\gamma(T) := \min\{|\lambda|, \ \lambda \in \sigma(T), \ \lambda \neq 1\} < 1$. If T is convergent, the iterative scheme (2) converges to a solution of (1) which depends, in general, on the initial guess x^0.

Definition 1.1. Let $A = B - C$ be a splitting, and $T = B^{-1}C$ the corresponding iteration matrix. The splitting is called *weak* if $T \geq 0$ [32], *weak regular* if $B^{-1} \geq 0$ and $T \geq 0$ [9], [43], *regular* if $B^{-1} \geq 0$ and $C \geq 0$ [52], and an *M-splitting* if B is an M-matrix and $C \geq 0$, [33], [46]. A nonsingular M-matrix can be defined as having nonpositive off-diagonal elements and its inverse being nonnegative; see, e.g., [9], [52].

Recall that a real, not necessarily symmetric matrix C is *positive definite* if $x^TCx > 0$ for all real $x \neq 0$. This is equivalent to requiring that the symmetric part of C, denoted $C^S := (C + C^T)/2$, be positive definite in the usual sense. The following concept is very useful in analyzing the convergence of iterative methods for symmetric positive (semi)definite matrices.

Definition 1.2. [41] A splitting $A = B - C$ is called *P-regular* if $B + C$ is positive definite.

Note that this is equivalent to requiring that the symmetric matrix $B + B^T - A$ be positive definite.

The classifications in definitions 1.1–1.2 have been used as important tools to obtain convergence results of the methods of the form (2). In particular, we have the following convergence result for monotone matrices. A nonsingular matrix A is called *monotone* if $A^{-1} \geq 0$.

LEMMA 1.3. [9] *Let $A = B - C$ be a weak regular splitting, and let $T = B^{-1}C$. Then $\rho(T) < 1$ if and only if the matrix A is monotone.*

For the case of nonsingular A, the following simple result was used, e.g., in [11], [27], [30], [49], to obtain a splitting *induced* by a given iteration matrix, and to then consider the characteristics of the induced splitting to study convergence.

LEMMA 1.4. [30] *Let A and T be square matrices such that A and $I - T$ are nonsingular. Then, there exists a unique pair of matrices B, C, such that B is nonsingular, $T = B^{-1}C$ and $A = B - C$. The matrices are $B = A(I - T)^{-1}$ and $C = B - A$.*

This lemma can be very useful when analyzing parallel algorithms, since the application of many operators simultaneously can be rewritten as a single splitting whose properties can then be analyzed; see, e.g., [10], [40] or [53], where the lemma was implicitly used. It is also useful for studying the convergence of two-stage methods [30] and of alternating iterations; see Section 4. We point out that the constructive properties of Lemma 1.4, though simple and very useful, were not always appreciated; see, e.g., [37, Section 2] where it is mentioned that the conclusions of the lemma do not hold.

REMARK 1.5. Lemma 1.4 also lets one reinterpret certain well-known iterative methods which are not usually written in the form (2). For example, each iteration of a k-step method [38] or of a semi-iterative method [16], [17], [51] can be interpreted as an iteration of the form (2) with the splitting provided by Lemma 1.4. A similar observation can be made with respect to polynomial preconditioners [1], [2].

REMARK 1.6. The hypothesis in Lemma 1.4 that $I - T$ is nonsingular is equivalent to $1 \notin \sigma(T)$ which is precisely the condition of compatibility with A being nonsingular, i.e., with $0 \notin \sigma(A)$. In other words, this hypothesis is essential since otherwise the identity $A = B(I - T)$ cannot hold.

The following observation, which is a little surprising at first, is a direct consequence of the uniqueness in Lemma 1.4.

REMARK 1.7. Let A and T satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 1.4. The characteristics of the unique splitting induced by T are intrinsically already given, i.e., if the splitting is weak, weak regular, etc. this is intrinsic in the structure of A and T.

In this paper we further consider iterative methods of the form (2) when the matrix A is singular and the system (1) is solvable, e.g., when one is looking for the stationary probability distribution of a Markov chain [9], or when solving discretized elliptic partial differential equations with Neumann or periodic boundary conditions [39], [44]. As it turns out, in the singular case, the results analogous to Lemma 1.4 and Remark 1.7 are totally opposite to those in the nonsingular case: there are infinitely many splittings induced by the same iteration matrix, and different splittings induced by the same matrices can have different properties.

The results in this paper deal with the existence and uniqueness of the splittings. The existence question, sometimes referred to as the consistency question, has been studied before, e.g., in [8], [39], [50], [55]. Here we present a constructive proof. The existence result together with the study of uniqueness (or nonuniqueness) sheds new light on some known iterative methods, cf. Remark 1.5 and [14]. In addition, in sections 4 and 5, we use these results to analyze a whole class of alternating iterations for the solution of linear systems.

2. Splittings of Singular Matrices.

By $\mathcal{N}(M)$ and $\mathcal{R}(M)$ we denote the null space and the range of the matrix M, respectively. We begin this section with a result analogous to Lemma 1.4.

THEOREM 2.1. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ be a singular matrix of rank $n-k<n$. If $A = B - C$ is a splitting, then there are infinitely many other splittings $A = F - G$ with the same iteration matrix $T = B^{-1}C$. Furthermore, if two splittings $A = B - (B - A) =$*

$F-(F-A)$ are such that they have the same iteration matrix $T = I - B^{-1}A = I - F^{-1}A$, then there exists a matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times k}$ such that $F = (B^{-1}+UV^T)^{-1}$, where $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times k}$ is a matrix whose columns belong to $\mathcal{N}(A^T)$ and $I+V^TBU$ is nonsingular. The rank of the difference $B-F$ is at most k.

Proof. Let $k = \dim \mathcal{N}(A^T) = \dim \mathcal{N}(A)$. Let $0 \neq V \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times k}$ be a matrix whose columns lie in $\mathcal{N}(A^T)$ and let U be any $n\times k$ matrix such that $I+V^TBU$ is nonsingular (note that it is always possible to find a nonzero matrix U with this property). Let $F = M^{-1}$, and $G = F - A$, where $M = B^{-1} + UV^T$. The nonsingularity of M can be established using the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula, found, e.g., in [21]. It follows that $F^{-1}G = I - F^{-1}A = I - B^{-1}A = T$ and the first part of the theorem is proved.

For the second part, from $F^{-1}A = B^{-1}A$ it follows that $A^T(F^{-T} - B^{-T}) = 0$, that is, the columns of $F^{-T} - B^{-T}$ are in the null space of A^T:

$$(F^{-T} - B^{-T})e_j \in \mathcal{N}(A^T) \quad \text{for all} \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, n, \tag{3}$$

where e_j is the jth column of the identity. Let $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k$ be a basis of $\mathcal{N}(A^T)$, then for each $1 \leq j \leq n$ there exist scalars $u_{j1}, u_{j2}, \ldots, u_{jk}$ such that $(F^{-T} - B^{-T})e_j = \sum_{i=1}^{k} u_{ji} v_i$. Let now V be the $n\times k$ matrix whose ith column is v_i and U be the $n \times k$ matrix whose entry in position (i, j) is u_{ij}, then we can rewrite the last identity as $F^{-T} - B^{-T} = VU^T$ or, equivalently, as $F^{-1} = B^{-1} + UV^T$. From the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula we get

$$F = (B^{-1} + UV^T)^{-1} = B - BU(I + V^TBU)^{-1}V^TB. \tag{4}$$

The invertibility of $I + V^TBU$ readily follows from the assumption that B and F are both invertible. Indeed, $F^{-1} = B^{-1} + UV^T = B^{-1}(I + BUV^T)$ implies that $I + BUV^T$ is nonsingular, that is, -1 is not an eigenvalue of BUV^T. Because the nonzero eigenvalues of BUV^T are the same as those of V^TBU, we can conclude that $I + V^TBU$ is also nonsingular.

Finally, from (3) it follows that the rank of $F^{-T} - B^{-T}$ is $r \leq k$, and thus, directly from (4) the difference between F and B is a matrix of rank r. In this case the matrix U can be chosen to have exactly $k-r$ zero columns, and the corresponding columns of V can be replaced by zero columns. Equivalently, such columns can just be deleted.

For instance, if A is a singular, irreducible M-matrix then $k = 1$ and matrices B, F inducing the same iteration matrix T can differ at most by a rank-one matrix. $\square$

We point out that in the proof of Theorem 2 in [6], given the iteration matrix of a certain parallel algorithm, a splitting is constructed to analyze the convergence. Theorem 2.1 implies that the splitting constructed is not the only possible one. Similarly, in [28], where multisplittings methods for a singular matrix A are studied, a nonsingular matrix P is defined so that the iteration matrix is $H = I - PA$. In light of Theorem 2.1, the matrix P, and thus the splitting $A = P^{-1} - P^{-1}H$ are not unique. Furthermore, as remarked below, the splittings need not be weak regular; see also the comments in Section 3.

The nonuniqueness revealed by Theorem 2.1 implies that each step of a semi-iterative method applied to a singular system of equations, as in, e.g., [15], [34], can be derived from infinitely many splittings, cf. Remark 1.5.

Remark 2.2. In the context of Theorem 2.1, if $A = M - N$ is a weak splitting, so is any other splitting of A. But, unlike the nonsingular case, and as the following example shows, one can be a regular splitting (or even an M-splitting) while the other may not even be weak regular (only weak).

Example 2.3. Let $A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$. Consider

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } F = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -2 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $N = M - A$, $G = F - A$, so that $T = M^{-1}N = F^{-1}G$. Note that $A = M - N$ is an M-splitting and thus a regular splitting, but $A = F - G$ is only weak. Also, notice that $A = M - N$ is a P-regular splitting of the symmetric positive semidefinite matrix A, whereas $A = F - G$ is not. Furthermore, $F^{-1} = M^{-1} - 2ee^T$ where $e = (1, 1)^T \in \mathcal{N}(A^T)$, showing that the two matrices M and F differ by a rank-one matrix.

Theorem 2.1 dealt with the issue of uniqueness. We turn our attention now to the existence of a corresponding splitting. The following lemma has Remark 1.6 as a particular case.

LEMMA 2.4. *Let A and T be square matrices. A necessary condition for the existence of a splitting $A = B - C$ with $T = B^{-1}C$ is that $\mathcal{N}(A) = \mathcal{N}(I - T)$.*

Proof. It follows from the fact that if $A = B - C$ with B nonsingular, we have $A = B(I - T)$. □

The following result shows that the condition is also sufficient, and it gives a method for constructing a corresponding splitting.

THEOREM 2.5. *Let A and T be $n \times n$ matrices such that*

$$\mathcal{N}(A) = \mathcal{N}(I - T). \tag{5}$$

Then, there exists a nonsingular matrix B such that $A = B - C$ and $T = B^{-1}C$.

Proof. Let $r = rank(A) = rank(I - T)$. Let $a_{i_1}, a_{i_2} \ldots, a_{i_r}$ be r linearly independent columns of A. From the hypothesis (5) it follows that $h_{i_1}, h_{i_2} \ldots, h_{i_r}$ are linearly independent columns of $H = I - T$. Let $v_j = a_{i_j}$, $w_j = h_{i_j}$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, r$. Let $v_{r+1}, \ldots, v_n$ a basis of $\mathcal{N}(A^T) = \mathcal{R}(A)^\perp$ and $w_{r+1}, \ldots, w_n$ a basis of $\mathcal{R}(I - T)^\perp$. The nonsingular matrix B we are looking for can be defined by

$$Bw_j = v_j \quad \text{for} \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, n. \tag{6}$$

In other words, let $V = [v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n]$ and $W = [w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n]$, then chose $B = VW^{-1}$. To see that the matrix B thus constructed satisfies

$$A = B(I - T), \tag{7}$$

we look at this equality one column at a time. If $k = i_j$ for some j, i.e., if a_k belongs to the chosen basis of $\mathcal{R}(A)$, the equality (7) follows from the definition of B in (6). If a_k is not in the chosen basis of $\mathcal{R}(A)$, we write $a_k = \sum_{j=1}^{r} \alpha_j v_j = B \sum_{j=1}^{r} \alpha_j w_j = Bh_k$, where the last equality follows from the hypothesis (5). □

Theorem 2.5 is not new. It can be found, e.g., in [8], [54], [55]. The proof here does not use the Jordan form of the matrix. Note also that the different choices of the vectors $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ and $w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n$ in the proof produce different splittings of A, cf. Theorem 2.1.

We illustrate the results in theorems 2.1 and 2.5, and Lemma 2.4 with two examples.

Example 2.6. Let $A = \begin{bmatrix} .3 & -.5 \\ -.3 & .5 \end{bmatrix}$ and $T = \begin{bmatrix} .5 & .5 \\ .5 & .5 \end{bmatrix}$. Thus, $\mathcal{N}(A)$ is spanned by $(5,3)^T$, while $\mathcal{N}(I-T)$ is spanned by $(1,1)^T$, and condition (5) does not hold. Since the two columns of $I-T$ are just negative of each other, while those of A are not, there is no nonsingular matrix B such that $A = B(I-T)$.

Example 2.7. Let A be as in Example 2.6, and let

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} .4 & 1 \\ .3 & .5 \end{bmatrix}. \text{ Thus } I - T = \begin{bmatrix} .6 & -1 \\ -.3 & .5 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is easy to see that (5) holds. The matrices defined in Theorem 2.5 can be chosen as

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } W = \begin{bmatrix} -2 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}. \text{ Thus } B = VW^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} .6 & .2 \\ -.2 & .6 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $B^{-1} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 3 & -1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \not\geq 0$, the splitting $A = B - (B - A)$ is only weak. We can construct a regular splitting using the technique in Theorem 2.1 by choosing $v \in \mathcal{N}(A^T)$ as $v^T = (1,1)$ and $u^T = (1,0)$, thus obtaining

$$F^{-1} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 5 & 1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad F = \frac{1}{7}\begin{bmatrix} 3 & -1 \\ -1 & 5 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } G = F - A = \frac{1}{70}\begin{bmatrix} 9 & 25 \\ 11 & 15 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0.$$

3. Other Consequences of the Theory. It is a consequence of the theory described so far that a splitting need not be regular or weak regular in order to obtain a convergent iteration (2). Thus, for example in Theorem 2 of [36], the hypothesis of regular splitting can be replaced with just being a weak splitting, and actually the proof in [36] carries through with no changes. This fact is also illustrated in lemmas 4.4 and 4.5 of [33] where the hypothesis used is of having a weak splitting, and relates to the index of the eigenvalue 1 of the iteration matrix. This situation is also consistent with the observation in [33] and in [48] that condition (3) in the theorem in [48] is independent of the splitting chosen. Another possible interpretation of the results presented is that for singular matrices, convergence follows only from the study of the iteration matrix, and not from the splitting. This is done, e.g., in [23, Section 2].

From a computational viewpoint, given a singular matrix A, and a linear system (1), one could choose a compatible iteration matrix T in the sense of condition (5), such that it is convergent, and that $\gamma(T)$ is small, and then compute the corresponding splitting to produce the iteration (2). For example, given A in examples 2.6 and 2.7, the standard Jacobi splitting gives rise to an iteration matrix T with $\gamma(T) = 1$, i.e., it is not convergent, while the choice of the simple splitting $A = I - (I - A)$ gives $\gamma(T) = 0.2$, and T chosen as in Example 2.7 gives $\gamma(T) = 0.1$. It goes without saying that this viewpoint is not a recommended procedure in general because of the expense of finding a corresponding splitting.

The essence of Remark 1.5 remains valid for the singular case: certain stationary iterative methods which are usually not thought of as deriving from a splitting of A, are actually mathematically equivalent to processes of the form (2); cf. [14]. Let us consider first the block Cimmino iteration; see, e.g., [4], [7], [18]. In this method, the coefficient matrix A is partitioned into p blocks of rows,

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 \\ A_2 \\ \vdots \\ A_p \end{pmatrix}$$

where each block A_i is a matrix with m_i rows and n columns, and $\sum_{i=1}^{p} m_i = n$. Let b be partitioned conformally to A, then the block Cimmino iteration for the solution of (1) is defined by

$$x^{k+1} = x^k + \omega \sum_{i=1}^{p} A_i^{\dagger}(b_i - A_i x^k), \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots, \tag{8}$$

where $A_i^{\dagger}$ denotes the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of A_i [9], $\omega > 0$ is a convergence factor, and x^0 is the initial guess. Let $K = \sum_{i=1}^{p} A_i^\dagger A_i$, and $T = I - \omega K$. We can rewrite (8) as

$$x^{k+1} = Tx^k + \omega \sum_{i=1}^{p} A_i^\dagger b_i = Tx^k + Rb, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots, \tag{9}$$

where $R = \omega(A_1^\dagger, \ , A_2^\dagger, \ldots, A_p^\dagger)$. It is readily verified that R is nonsingular if and only if A is. Thus, when A is nonsingular, $B = R^{-1}$ is well-defined, and the iterative scheme (9) has the form (2), with $T = B^{-1}C$, $C = B - A$. Hence, the Cimmino iterates can be obtained from the unique splitting $A = B - C$ induced by A and T as per Lemma 1.4. As is well-known, the iteration converges if and only if $0 < \omega < 2/\rho(K)$.

Consider now the situation where A is singular. Even in this case, the Cimmino iteration matrix T always verifies the compatibility condition (5); see, e.g., [18, Lemma 7]. It follows from theorems 2.1 and 2.5 that there exist infinitely many splittings of the type $A = B - C$ inducing the same iteration matrix T. However, since $R = \omega(A_1^\dagger, \ , A_2^\dagger, \ldots, A_p^\dagger)$ is now singular, we can no longer use it to define a splitting. Instead, we can use the procedure described in the proof of Theorem 2.5 to construct a splitting.

The other class of methods which can be seen as having the form (2) are alternating methods, which are analyzed in the next section.

4. The Convergence of Alternating Iterations. Consider the general class of iterative methods for the solution of (1) of the form

$$x^{k+1/2} = M^{-1}Nx^k + M^{-1}b, \quad x^{k+1} = P^{-1}Qx^{k+1/2} + P^{-1}b, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots, \tag{10}$$

where $A = M - N = P - Q$ are splittings of a possibly singular matrix A, and x^0 is the given initial guess. Many well-known methods belong to this class. When $P = M^T$, the first iteration of this kind is perhaps Aitken's *to-and-fro* method (symmetric Gauss-Seidel) [3], [25]. Its extrapolated version is Sheldon's SSOR (Symmetric Successive Over-Relaxation) scheme [47], [54]. One important feature of this method is that when A is symmetric positive definite (SPD), its convergence may be enhanced by Chebyshev or conjugate gradient acceleration; see, e.g., [5], [21], [42]. Another set of algorithms in the class described by (10) are the alternating direction implicit methods (ADI), see, e.g., [31], [54]. ADI methods are routinely used to reduce a large complex problem, such as an elliptic partial difference equation in two or three dimensions, to a set of simpler, smaller problems which can be easily solved, possibly in parallel [42]. We also mention here the methods considered by Conrad and Wallach [12], [13], including SSOR and one alternating between a Gauss-Seidel and a Jacobi sweep. They presented efficient implementations on parallel computers with substantial operation savings.

Further motivation for the study of iteration (10) comes from the observation that some of the basic multigrid methods can be reinterpreted as alternating iterations applied to a certain augmented *singular* linear system; see [22]. For instance, the multigrid V-cycle with one pre- and post-smoothing Gauss-Seidel step for a linear system with an SPD coefficient matrix is equivalent to Aitken's symmetric Gauss-Seidel method on an augmented system with a symmetric positive semidefinite coefficient matrix.

To analyze the convergence of the general scheme (10) we construct a single splitting $A = B - C$ associated with the iteration matrix. To that end, let us eliminate $x^{k+1/2}$ from (10) and obtain the iterative process

$$x^{k+1} = P^{-1}QM^{-1}Nx^k + P^{-1}(QM^{-1} + I)b, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots, \tag{11}$$

which is of the form (2), where $T = P^{-1}QM^{-1}N$. We mention that for A symmetric and positive definite, this formulation has already been used to prove the convergence of SSOR; see, e.g., [42, pp. 258–259]. We use this formulation to study the convergence of (10) under the assumption that A is either monotone or symmetric and positive (semi)definite.

We note that the convergence of the individual splittings $A = M - N$ and $A = P - Q$ does not guarantee the convergence of the alternating iteration (10). This follows from the fact that the product of zero-convergent matrices is not necessarily zero-convergent (see, e.g., [26], [45]) and is illustrated by the following example.

Example 4.1. Consider the symmetric positive definite M-matrix $A = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$

and the splittings $A = M - N = P - Q$, where

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad P = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Both splittings are convergent, since $M^{-1}N = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $P^{-1}Q = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Yet $T = P^{-1}QM^{-1}N = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and therefore the iteration (10) is not convergent.

If A is nonsingular, we use Lemma 1.4 to obtain the unique splitting $A = B - C$ such that $B^{-1}C = T$. It is very natural to ask which properties of the splittings $A = M - N = P - Q$ are inherited by $A = B - C$. This question can be answered in a fairly complete manner together with sufficient conditions for the convergence of (10) if A is monotone or symmetric positive (semi)definite. We begin with the monotone case.

Theorem 4.2. *Let A be nonsingular, and $A^{-1} \geq 0$. If the splittings $A = M - N = P - Q$ are weak regular, then $T = P^{-1}QM^{-1}N$ is zero-convergent, and therefore the sequence $\{x^k\}$ generated by (10) converges to the unique solution of $Ax = b$ for any choice of the initial guess x^0. Furthermore, the unique splitting $A = B - C$ induced by T is weak regular.*

Proof. We will show that $\rho(T) < 1$. From

$$T = (I - P^{-1}A)(I - M^{-1}A) = I - P^{-1}A - M^{-1}A + P^{-1}AM^{-1}A$$

we find that

$$(I - T)A^{-1} = P^{-1} + M^{-1} - P^{-1}AM^{-1} = P^{-1} + (I - P^{-1}A)M^{-1}.$$

Because the splittings are weak regular, it follows that $T \geq 0$ and also $(I-T)A^{-1} \geq 0$. Hence $0 \leq (I + T + T^2 + \cdots + T^m)(I - T)A^{-1} = (I - T^{m+1})A^{-1} \leq A^{-1}$ for every nonnegative integer m. It follows, by a standard argument (see, e.g., [41]), that the partial sums of the series $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} T^m$ remain uniformly bounded (in norm). Therefore, the series is convergent, and $\rho(T) < 1$.

Let $A = B - C$ be the unique splitting corresponding to $T = P^{-1}QM^{-1}N$, cf. Lemma 1.4 and (11). We have that

$$(12)\ B^{-1} = P^{-1}(QM^{-1} + I) = P^{-1} + (I - P^{-1}A)M^{-1} = P^{-1}(M + P - A)M^{-1}.$$

Observe that the nonsingularity of $M + P - A$ follows from that of $I - T$ (cf. Remark 1.6) and the following identity

$$I - T = (P^{-1} + M^{-1} - P^{-1}AM^{-1})A = P^{-1}(M + P - A)M^{-1}A.$$

We see from (12) that $B^{-1} \geq 0$, and the proof is complete. □

Theorem 4.2 implies that weak regularity is a property which the single splitting $A = B - C$ inherits from the original splittings $A = M - N = P - Q$. The following example shows that if $A = M - N = P - Q$ are both regular splittings, the induced splitting $A = B - C$ need not inherit that property.

Example 4.3. Consider the M-matrix $A = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -2 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$ and the splittings $A = M - N = P - Q$, where $M = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$ and $P = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$. Both splittings are regular, but the unique splitting $A = B - C$ such that $B^{-1}C = T = P^{-1}QM^{-1}N$ is given by

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 7/3 & -2/3 \\ -13/6 & 7/3 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad C = B - A = \begin{bmatrix} 1/3 & 1/3 \\ -1/6 & 1/3 \end{bmatrix}$$

and therefore it is not regular.

Let us consider now the case where A is singular. In this case, it follows from theorems 2.1 and 2.5 and Lemma 2.4 that there are either infinitely many splittings corresponding to T, or none at all, depending on whether or not the compatibility condition (5) is satisfied. It turns out that, unlike in the nonsingular case, weak regularity of the splittings $A = M - N = P - Q$ does not imply compatibility. Consider, for example, the symmetric positive semidefinite M-matrix A from Example 2.3, with the weak regular splittings defined by $M = P = I$. Obviously, $M + P - A$ is singular, and the compatibility condition is violated. However, if we *impose* that

$M+P-A$ be nonsingular, then the compatibility condition (5) holds, and the iteration matrix $T = P^{-1}QM^{-1}N$ is induced by the splitting

$$A = B - C, \text{ where } \quad B = P(M+P-A)^{-1}M. \tag{13}$$

It follows from (12) that $B^{-1} \geq 0$ and thus, this splitting is weak regular. Hence, we have proved the following result.

THEOREM 4.4. *Let A be a singular matrix. If the splittings $A = M - N = P - Q$ are weak regular and $M + P - A$ is nonsingular, the splitting (13) is a weak regular splitting and $B^{-1}C = T = P^{-1}QM^{-1}N$.*

The splitting (13) is weak regular, but not all splittings corresponding to T are weak regular, as the following example reveals.

EXAMPLE 4.5. Let A and M be as in Example 2.3, and let $P = M^T$. Then $A = M - (M - A) = P - (P - A)$ are M-splittings (hence, weak regular), the compatibility condition holds since $M + P - A = I$ is nonsingular and the splitting (13) is weak regular (indeed, it is an M-splitting), in agreement with Theorem 4.4. However, if we let $F^{-1} = B^{-1} - 2ee^T$ where $e = (1,1)^T$ we have another splitting corresponding to T, which is not weak regular.

We note that in many practical situations, the nonsingularity of $M+P-A$ is not difficult to check. Consider, as a simple example, the symmetric Gauss-Seidel method. If $A = L + D + U$ is the usual splitting of A into its lower triangular, diagonal, and upper triangular parts, then $M = L+D$, $P = D+U$ and $M+P-A = D$ is invertible if and only if A has no zeros on the main diagonal.

As is well-known, if the matrix A is singular, having a weak regular splitting is not sufficient for convergence of a method of the form (2), thus the hypotheses of Theorem 4.4 need to be supplemented. For example, if A is a singular, irreducible M-matrix, the results in [36] imply that $\rho(T) = 1$, and letting $T_\alpha := (1-\alpha)I + \alpha T$, the powers T_α^k converge to a limiting matrix (independent of α) as $k \to \infty$, for all $\alpha \in (0,1)$. That is, T_α is convergent and the iteration (2) with T replaced by T_α is convergent to a solution of (1).

Next, we consider the symmetric positive (semi)definite case. There are many analogies, but also some interesting differences, with the monotone case. We already know, from Example 4.1, that convergence of the individual splittings $A = M - N$ and $A = P - Q$ of a symmetric positive definite matrix is not sufficient to insure convergence of the alternating iteration (10). However, things work very nicely if the splittings are P-regular, for this property is inherited by the iteration matrix T of the combined iteration (2).

THEOREM 4.6. *Let A be symmetric positive definite. If the splittings $A = M - N = P - Q$ are P-regular, then $T = P^{-1}QM^{-1}N$ is zero-convergent. Therefore, the sequence $\{x^k\}$ generated by (10) converges to the unique solution of $Ax = b$ for any choice of the initial guess x^0. Moreover, the unique splitting induced by the iteration matrix is P-regular.*

Proof. We show that $A - T^TAT$ is positive definite (convergence will then follow from Stein's Theorem; see, e.g., [41]). Since the splittings $A = M - N = P - Q$ are P-regular, we know that $S := A - (P^{-1}Q)^TA(P^{-1}Q)$ and $R := A - (M^{-1}N)^TA(M^{-1}N)$ are both positive definite. Thus, the matrix $H := (M^{-1}N)^TS(M^{-1}N)$ is positive semidefinite. But

$$H = (M^{-1}N)^TA(M^{-1}N) - (M^{-1}N)^T(P^{-1}Q)^TA(P^{-1}Q)(M^{-1}N),$$

and therefore $R + H = A - T^TAT$ is positive definite.
The induced splitting is given by (13). This splitting is P-regular, as is clear from the identity

$$A - T^TAT = A - (B^{-1}C)^TA(B^{-1}C) = (B^{-1}A)^T(B + B^T - A)(B^{-1}A)$$

and the first part of the proof. □

REMARK 4.7. In the important special case $M = P^T$, B is actually SPD, since

$$B^{-1} = M^{-T}(M + M^T - A)M^{-1}.$$

It follows that T is symmetrizable, and therefore Chebyshev or CG acceleration can be used. Besides SSOR, an important example is provided by alternating iterations based on a splitting of the form $A = A_1 + A_2$ with A_1, A_2 positive definite and such that $A_2 = A_1^T$; see, e.g., [31]. Letting $M = rI + A_1$, $N = rI - A_2$, $P = rI + A_2$ and $Q = rI - A_1$, with $r > 0$, the splittings $A = M - N = P - Q$ are P-regular (because $M + M^T - A = 2rI$), and $M = P^T$. The convergence of the corresponding alternating iteration is insured by Theorem 4.6. Its proof is much more general and a lot simpler than the one usually found in the literature, which relies on Kellog's Lemma; see, e.g., [31]. As we shall see, it has the additional advantage that it carries through easily to the singular case, as well as to multiple splittings; see Remark 4.11.

Remark 4.8. The unique splitting $A = B - C$ such that $B^{-1}C = T = P^{-1}QM^{-1}N$ may be P-regular, and hence convergent, even if the splittings $A = M - N = P - Q$ are not P-regular. This shows the usefulness of rewriting the alternating iteration as a single splitting. An example is provided by the Alternating Direction Implicit methods (ADI), in which the SPD matrix A is split as $A = A_1 + A_2$ with A_1 and A_2 symmetric positive definite. If M, N, P and Q are defined as in Remark 4.7, with $r > 0$, it is easy to see with examples that the splittings $A = M - N = P - Q$ are not P-regular, generally speaking. Nevertheless, it is possible to associate a single splitting $A = B - C$ to the iteration, with

$$B^{-1} = P^{-1}(M + P - A)M^{-1} = (rI + A_2)^{-1}(2rI)(rI + A_1)^{-1}.$$

It follows that B is invertible for all $r > 0$, with $B = \frac{1}{2r}(rI + A_1)(rI + A_2)$, and therefore $B + B^T - A = rI + \frac{1}{2r}(A_1A_2 + A_2A_1)$. In the commutative case (i.e., when $A_1A_2 = A_2A_1$) we find that $B + B^T - A$ is SPD because A_1A_2, as the product of two SPD matrices, has real positive eigenvalues. Hence, $A = B - C$ is a P-regular splitting (for all $r > 0$) and therefore $\rho(T) < 1$. Moreover, T is symmetrizable and acceleration techniques can be used. However, if the commutativity condition is not satisfied, it may happen that $A = B - C$ is a P-regular splitting only for sufficiently large r, yet the ADI iteration converges for all $r > 0$.

We next analyze the case where A is symmetric positive semidefinite, using as a tool the following generalization of Stein's Theorem to the singular case.

Lemma 4.9. [20] *A matrix T is convergent if and only if there exist two symmetric positive semidefinite matrices Z, Y, such that $Z = Y - T^TYT$ and $\mathcal{N}(I - T) = \mathcal{N}(Y) = \mathcal{N}(Z)$.*

THEOREM 4.10. *Let A be symmetric positive semidefinite. If the splittings $A = M - N = P - Q$ are P-regular, then $T = P^{-1}QM^{-1}N$ is convergent. Moreover, T induces infinitely many splittings of A, and they are all P-regular.*

Proof. First we prove that $M + P - A$ is nonsingular, showing that the compatibility condition (5) is verified. Since $A = M - N = P - Q$ are P-regular splittings, matrices $M + M^T - A$ and $P + P^T - A$ are both positive definite. But since the symmetric part of $M + P - A$ is

$$(M+P-A)^S = (M+P-A)/2+(M^T+P^T-A)/2 = (M+M^T-A)/2+(P+P^T-A)/2,$$

$M + P - A$ is positive definite and therefore nonsingular. Hence $B^{-1} = P^{-1}(M + P - A)M^{-1}$ is well-defined and $B^{-1}C = T$. To prove that T is convergent, we apply Lemma 4.9 with $Y = A$, the original coefficient matrix. The same argument used in the nonsingular case (Theorem 4.6) shows that $Z = A - T^TAT$ is now positive semidefinite. Also, $I - T = B^{-1}A$ implies $\mathcal{N}(I - T) = \mathcal{N}(A)$. We only have left to show that $\mathcal{N}(Z) = \mathcal{N}(A)$. First we show that $\mathcal{N}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(Z)$. Let $v \in \mathcal{N}(A)$, then $v = Tv$ and therefore $Zv = Av - T^TATv = Av - T^TAv = 0$, hence $v \in \mathcal{N}(Z)$. To prove the inclusion in the other direction, let $R = A - (M^{-1}N)^TA(M^{-1}N)$, $S = A - (P^{-1}Q)^TA(P^{-1}Q)$. Since $M^{-1}N$ is convergent, using Lemma 4.9, we have that $\mathcal{N}(R) = \mathcal{N}(A)$. Since $Z = R + (M^{-1}N)^TS(M^{-1}N)$ is a symmetric positive semidefinite matrix, it follows that $Zv = 0$ if and only if $v^TZv = 0$ (see [24, p. 400]), therefore $v \in \mathcal{N}(Z)$ if and only if $v^TRv = -v^T(M^{-1}N)^TS(M^{-1}N)v$. In this equality, the quantity on the left-hand side is nonnegative, the one on the right-hand side is nonpositive and therefore they must be both zero. Hence, $Rv = 0$, but since $\mathcal{N}(R) = \mathcal{N}(A)$, $v \in \mathcal{N}(A)$ and the convergence of T is established.
Finally, we show that the splitting $A = B - C$ is P-regular. We have just shown that $Zv = 0$ if and only if $Av = 0$; because Z is symmetric positive semidefinite, this is equivalent to saying that $v^TZv = 0$ if and only if $Av = 0$, or that $(B^{-1}Av)^T(B + B^T - A)(B^{-1}Av) = 0$ if and only if $Av = 0$. Clearly, this is equivalent to saying that $B + B^T - A$ is symmetric positive definite, that is, $A = B - C$ is a P-regular splitting. This argument is valid for *any* of the infinitely many splittings $A = B - C$ such that $B^{-1}C = P^{-1}QM^{-1}N$, and not just for the splitting (13). □

Theorem 4.10 points to some interesting differences between the weak regular case and the P-regular case. In the first case, in Theorem 4.4, it is necessary to require that $M+P-A$ be nonsingular, whereas this is automatically true in the P-regular case. In other words, the compatibility condition (5) is always fulfilled in the P-regular case. Furthermore, the P-regularity of the splittings $A=M-N=P-Q$ is inherited by all the infinitely many splittings, induced by T, but we know that this is not true for the weak regular case; see Example 4.5. In this sense, P-regularity is a stronger assumption than weak regularity.

REMARK 4.11. Many of the results of this section and the next, can be extended to alternating schemes involving more than two splittings of the coefficient matrix A. For example, in the solution of three-dimensional problems it is useful to consider three splittings $A=M-N=P-Q=R-S$ and the corresponding three-step alternating procedure. This requires studying the convergence of the iteration matrix $T=R^{-1}SP^{-1}QM^{-1}N$. The extension to this case, or to an arbitrary number of splittings, can be done by recursively applying the results shown for two splittings.

5. A Comparison Theorem. The following comparison theorem confirms the intuitively reasonable property that the asymptotic rate of convergence of the alternating iteration (10) is at least as good as the rate of convergence of the fastest of the two basic iterations. This could also be interpreted by saying that the scheme (10) behaves like a predictor-corrector method.

THEOREM 5.1. *Let A be a monotone matrix. If the splittings $A=M-N=P-Q$ are regular, the following upper bound on the spectral radius of $T=P^{-1}QM^{-1}N$ holds*

$$\rho(T)\leq \min(\rho(M^{-1}N),\rho(P^{-1}Q)). \tag{14}$$

Proof. Let T be the iteration matrix corresponding to the induced splitting (13). We know from Theorem 4.2 that $A=B-C$ is a weak regular splitting. We have the following two matrix inequalities

$$B^{-1} = M^{-1}+P^{-1}NM^{-1} \geq M^{-1}, \tag{15}$$

$$B^{-1} = P^{-1}+P^{-1}QM^{-1} \geq P^{-1}. \tag{16}$$

We can now apply the comparison theorem for weak regular splittings due to Elsner [19] to $A=B-C$ and $A=M-N$ to get $\rho(T)\leq\rho(M^{-1}N)$. Applying the same result to $A = B - C$ and $A = P - Q$ we also get $\rho(T) \leq \rho(P^{-1}Q)$. Therefore, the upper bound (14) on $\rho(T)$ holds. $\square$

As was shown in [13], considerable savings in arithmetic operations are possible when implementing alternating iterations of the type (10). Together with our comparison result, this shows that alternating between two splittings can be advantageous over iterating with a single splitting, if A is monotone. Nevertheless, it would be desirable to have comparison theorems of the type (14) with strict inequality. This can be achieved by requiring that the inequalities (15) and (16) be strict; see [32]. To that end one can require that $P^{-1} > 0$ and that neither N or Q has any zero column. Furthermore, it is natural to ask if the assumptions in Theorem 5.1 can be somewhat weakened. Weaker hypotheses for the comparison could be attained trading the nonnegativity of Q with the requirement that $Qx > 0$ where x is the Frobenius eigenvector of $P^{-1}Q$, i.e., instead of Q mapping all nonnegative vectors to the positive hyperoctant, it needs only to map one vector; see [32]. However, $A = M - N$ still needs to be regular, and furthermore z, the Frobenius vector of $M^{-1}N$, must be strictly positive. These hypotheses are hard to check, except in some particular cases.

It is tempting to look for a similar comparison result for the symmetric positive definite case, e.g., using the results in Nabben [35]. However, those results are based, as it is natural, on the positive semidefinite ordering (see [24]), which would require M, P and B to be symmetric, if we are to compare the rates of convergence of T with those of $M^{-1}N$ and $P^{-1}Q$. One way to ensure that $B = M(M + P - A)^{-1}P$ is symmetric is to require that $M = P^T$, but since M and P must be symmetric, $M = P$ and the alternating iteration reduces to a single splitting scheme. A more interesting situation arises when M and P are symmetric and each pair of matrices M, P, A commutes. This condition, which is typical of the ADI method in the commutative case, ensures that B is symmetric. But in order to apply Nabben's comparison theorem it is necessary that the splittings $A = M - N = P - Q$ be P-regular, which is usually not true for the ADI method (see Remark 4.8). On the other hand, if we drop the requirement that M and P be symmetric, it can be seen that the alternating iteration (10) may be asymptotically slower than either of the iterations based on $A = M - N$ or $A = P - Q$. An example is provided by the SSOR method, which is known to be usually slower than the SOR method when the optimal values of the relaxation parameters are used; see [54, p. 462].

6. Conclusions. In the first part of the paper we review necessary and sufficient conditions for a pair of matrices A and T to have a splitting $A = B - C$ for which $T = B^{-1}C$. When A is nonsingular this splitting is unique. When A is singular, if such a splitting exists, there are infinitely many others. In Theorem 2.1 we show the relationship between all these splittings, while in Theorem 2.5 we provide a constructive way of obtaining one of them.

There are many iterative methods which at first glance may not correspond to a single splitting. The theory developed here sheds new light on some of these methods by providing the single splitting corresponding to the iteration matrix, and then analyzing the convergence of the method using the properties of the single splitting.

In the second part of the paper we analyze in detail certain alternating iterative methods. The theory developed in the first part plays a crucial role in this analysis. We show, for example, that if the different splittings defining each iteration are P-regular, there is overall convergence, and moreover, the induced splitting is also P-regular. This holds both in the symmetric positive definite case, as well as in the semidefinite case. Finally, a comparison result is presented which shows that the asymptotic convergence rate of the alternating method is at least as fast as the faster single iterative method defining each iteration.

Acknowledgment. We wish to thank Andreas Frommer for his comments on an earlier version of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

[1] Loyce M. Adams. m-step preconditioned conjugate gradient methods. *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing*, 6:452–462, 1985.

[2] Loyce M. Adams and Elizabeth Ong. Additive polynomial preconditioners for parallel computers. *Parallel Computing*, 9:333–345, 1988.

[3] Alexander C. Aitken. On the iterative solution of a system of linear equations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, Sec. A, 63:52–60, 1950.

[4] Mario Arioli, Iain S. Duff, Joseph Noailles, and Daniel Ruiz. A block projection method for sparse matrices. *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing*, 13:47–70, 1992.

[5] Owe Axelsson. *Iterative Solution Methods*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.

[6] Michele Benzi and Tuğrul Dayar. The arithmetic mean method for finding the stationary vector of Markov chains. *Parallel Algorithms and Applications*, 6:25–37, 1996.

[7] Michele Benzi, Fiorella Sgallari, and Giulia Spaletta. A parallel block projection method of the Cimmino type for finite Markov chains. In William J. Stewart, editor, *Computations with Markov Chains: Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on the Numerical Solution of Markov Chains*, pages 65–80. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1995.

[8] Abraham Berman and Michael Neumann. Consistency and splittings. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 13:877–888, 1976.

[9] Abraham Berman and Robert J. Plemmons. *Nonnegative Matrices in the Mathematical Sciences*. Academic Press, New York, third edition, 1979. Reprinted by SIAM, Philadelphia, 1994.

[10] Rafael Bru, Cristina Corral, Angeles Martínez, and José Mas. Multisplitting preconditioners based on incomplete Choleski factorizations. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 16, October 1995. To appear.

[11] Zhi-Hao Cao. On convergence of nested stationary iterative methods. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 221:159–170, 1995.

[12] Victor Conrad and Yehuda Wallach. Iterative solution of linear equations on a parallel processor system. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, C-26:838–847, 1977.

[13] Victor Conrad and Yehuda Wallach. Alternating methods for sets of linear equations. *Numerische Mathematik*, 32:105–108, 1979.

[14] Achiya Dax. The convergence of linear stationary iterative processes for solving singular unstructured systems of equations. *SIAM Review*, 32:611–635, 1990.

[15] Michael Eiermann, Ivo Marek, and Wilhelm Niethammer. On the solution of singular linear systems of algebraic equations by semiiterative methods. *Numerische Mathematik*, 53:265–283, 1988.

[16] Michael Eiermann and Wilhelm Niethammer. On the construction of semiiterative methods. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 20:1153–1160, 1983.

[17] Michael Eiermann, Wilhelm Niethammer, and Richard S. Varga. A study of semiiterative methods for nonsymmetric systems of linear equations. *Numerische Mathematik*, 47:505–533, 1985.

[18] Tommy Elfving. Block-iterative methods for consistent and inconsistent linear equations. *Numerische Mathematik*, 35:1–12, 1980.

[19] Ludwig Elsner. Comparison of weak regular splittings and multisplitting methods. *Numerische Mathematik*, 56:283–289, 1989.

[20] Alexandre Ern and Vincent Giovangigli. Projected iterative algorithms with application to multicomponent transport. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 1996. To Appear.

[21] Gene H. Golub and Charles F. Van Loan. *Matrix Computations*. The Johns Hopkins University

Press, Baltimore, second edition, 1989.

[22] Michael Griebel. Multilevel algorithms considered as iterative methods on semidefinite systems. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 15:547–565, 1994.

[23] Nicholas J. Higham and Philip A. Knight. Finite precision behavior of stationary iteration for solving singular systems. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 192:165–186, 1993.

[24] Roger A. Horn and Charles R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis.* Cambridge University Press, New York, 1985.

[25] Alston S. Householder. *The Theory of Matrices in Numerical Analysis.* Blaisdell Publishing Co., New York, 1964. Reprinted by Dover, New York, 1975.

[26] Charles R. Johnson and Rafael Bru. The spectral radius of a product of nonnegative matrices. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 141:227–240, 1990.

[27] Mark T. Jones and Daniel B. Szyld. Two-stage multisplitting methods with overlapping blocks. Technical Report 94-31, Department of Mathematics, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., March 1994. Also available as Technical Report CS-94-224, Computer Science Department, University of Tenessee, Knoxville, March 1994. To appear in *Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications.*

[28] J. Philip Kavanagh and Michael Neumann. Consistency and convergence of the parallel multisplitting method for singular M–matrices. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 10:210–218, 1989.

[29] Herbert B. Keller. On the solution of singular and semidefinite linear systems by iteration. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 2:281–290, 1965.

[30] Paul J. Lanzkron, Donald J. Rose, and Daniel B. Szyld. Convergence of nested classical iterative methods for linear systems. *Numerische Mathematik*, 58:685–702, 1991.

[31] Guri I. Marchuk. Splitting and alternating direction methods. In P. G. Ciarlet and J. L. Lions, editors, *Handbook of Numerical Analysis, Vol. I.*, 197–462. North Holland, New York, 1990.

[32] Ivo Marek and Daniel B. Szyld. Comparison theorems for weak splittings of bounded operators. *Numerische Mathematik*, 58:387–397, 1990.

[33] Ivo Marek and Daniel B. Szyld. Splittings of M-operators: Irreducibility and the index of the iteration operator. *Numerical Functional Analysis and Optimization*, 11:529–553, 1990.

[34] Ivo Marek and Daniel B. Szyld. Iterative and semi-iterative methods for computing stationary probability vectors of Markov operators. *Mathematics of Computation*, 61:719–731, 1993.

[35] Reinhard Nabben. A note on comparison theorems of splittings and multisplittings of Hermitian positive definite matrices. Preprint 94-017, University of Bielefeld, March 1994. To appear in *Linear Algebra and its Applications.*

[36] Michael Neumann and Robert J. Plemmons. Convergent nonnegative matrices and iterative methods for consistent linear systems. *Numerische Mathematik*, 31:265–279, 1978.

[37] Michael Neumann and Robert J. Plemmons. Convergence of parallel multisplitting iterative methods for M-matrices. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 88/89:559–573, 1987.

[38] Wilhelm Niethammer and Richard S. Varga. The analysis of k-step iterative methods for linear systems from summability theory. *Numerische Mathematik*, 41:177–206, 1983.

[39] M.J. O'Carroll. Inconsistencies and S.O.R. convergence for the discrete Neumann problem. *Journal of the Institute of Mathematics and its Applications*, 11:343–350, 1973.

[40] Dianne P. O'Leary and Robert E. White. Multi-splittings of matrices and parallel solution of linear systems. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic and Discrete Mathematics*, 6:630–640, 1985.

[41] James M. Ortega. *Numerical Analysis: A Second Course.* Academic Press, New York and London, 1972. Reprinted by SIAM, Philadelphia, 1990.

[42] James M. Ortega. *Introduction to Parallel and Vector Solution of Linear Systems.* Plenum Press, New York and London, 1988.

[43] James M. Ortega and Werner C. Rheinboldt. *Iterative Solution of Nonlinear Equations in Several Variables.* Academic Press, New York and London, 1970.

[44] Robert J. Plemmons. Regular splittings and the discrete Neumann problem. *Numerische Mathematik*, 25:153–161, 1976.

[45] F. Robert, M. Charnay, and F. Musy. Itérations chaotiques série-parallèle pour des équations non-linéaires de point fixe. *Aplikace Matematiky*, 20:1–38, 1975.

[46] Hans Schneider. Theorems on M-splittings of a singular M-matrix which depend on graph structure. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 58:407–424, 1984.

[47] John W. Sheldon. On the numerical solution of elliptic difference equations. *Mathematical Tables and Other Aids to Computation*, 9:101–112, 1955.

[48] Daniel B. Szyld. Equivalence of convergence conditions for iterative methods for singular equations. *Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications*, 1:151–154, 1994.

[49] Daniel B. Szyld and Mark T. Jones. Two-stage and multisplitting methods for the parallel solution of linear systems. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 13:671–679, 1992.

[50] Kunio Tanabe. Characterization of linear stationary iterative processes for solving a singular system of linear equations. *Numerische Mathematik*, 22:349–359, 1974.

[51] Richard S. Varga. A comparison of the successive overrelaxation method and semi-iterative methods using Chebyshev polynomials. *Journal of the Society of Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 5:39–46, 1957.

[52] Richard S. Varga. *Matrix Iterative Analysis.* Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1962.

[53] Robert E. White. Multisplitting with different weighting schemes. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 10:481–493, 1989.

[54] David M. Young. *Iterative Solution of Large Linear Systems.* Academic Press, New York, 1971.

[55] David M. Young. On the consistency of linear stationary iterative methods. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 9:89–96, 1972.