

## MINARES: AN ITERATIVE SOLVER FOR SYMMETRIC LINEAR SYSTEMS

ALEXIS MONTOISON<sup>\*</sup>, DOMINIQUE ORBAN<sup>†</sup>, AND MICHAEL A. SAUNDERS<sup>‡</sup>

**Abstract.** We introduce an iterative solver named MINARES for symmetric linear systems  $Ax \approx b$ , where  $A$  is possibly singular. MINARES is based on the symmetric Lanczos process, like MINRES and MINRES-QLP, but it minimizes  $\|Ar_k\|$  in each Krylov subspace rather than  $\|r_k\|$ , where  $r_k$  is the current residual vector. When  $A$  is symmetric, MINARES minimizes the same quantity  $\|Ar_k\|$  as LSMR, but in more relevant Krylov subspaces, and it requires only one matrix-vector product  $Av$  per iteration, whereas LSMR would need two. Our numerical experiments with MINRES-QLP and LSMR show that MINARES is a pertinent alternative on consistent symmetric systems and the most suitable Krylov method for inconsistent symmetric systems. We derive properties of MINARES from an equivalent solver named cAR that is to MINARES as CR is to MINRES, is not based on the Lanczos process, and minimizes  $\|Ar_k\|$  in the same Krylov subspace as MINARES. We establish that MINARES and cAR generate monotonic  $\|x_k - x^*\|$ ,  $\|x_k - x^*\|_A$  and  $\|r_k\|$  when  $A$  is positive definite.

**Key words.** MINARES, cAR, MINRES, CR, LSMR, symmetric, singular, inconsistent, iterative method, Lanczos process, Krylov subspace, QR factorization, LQ factorization

**AMS subject classifications.** 15A06, 65F10, 65F08, 65F22, 65F25, 65F35, 65F50, 90C06, 90C90

**1. Introduction.** Suppose  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is a large symmetric matrix for which matrix-vector products  $Av$  can be computed efficiently for any vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . We present a Krylov subspace method called MINARES for computing a solution to the following problems:

- (1.1) Symmetric linear systems:  $Ax = b$ ,
- (1.2) Symmetric least-squares problems:  $\min \|Ax - b\|$ ,
- (1.3) Symmetric nullspace problems:  $Ar = 0$ ,
- (1.4) Symmetric eigenvalue problems:  $Ar = \lambda r$ ,
- (1.5) Singular value problems for rectangular  $B$ :  $\begin{bmatrix} & B \\ B^T & \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix} = \sigma \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix}$ .

If  $A$  is nonsingular, problems (1.1)–(1.2) have a unique solution  $x^*$ . When  $A$  is singular, if  $b$  is not in the range of  $A$  then (1.1) has no solution; otherwise, (1.1)–(1.2) have an infinite number of solutions, and we seek the unique solution  $x^*$  that minimizes  $\|x\|$ . Whenever  $x^*$  exists, it solves the problem

$$(1.6) \quad \min \frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad A^2 x = Ab.$$

Let  $x_k$  be an approximation to  $x^*$  with residual  $r_k = b - Ax_k$ . If  $A$  were unsymmetric or rectangular, applicable solvers for (1.1)–(1.2) would be LSQR [16] and

---

<sup>\*</sup>GERAD and Department of Mathematics and Industrial Engineering, Polytechnique Montréal, QC, Canada. E-mail: [alexis.montoison@polymtl.ca](mailto:alexis.montoison@polymtl.ca). Research supported by an FRQNT grant and an excellence scholarship of the IVADO institute.

<sup>†</sup>GERAD and Department of Mathematics and Industrial Engineering, Polytechnique Montréal, QC, Canada. E-mail: [dominique.orban@gerad.ca](mailto:dominique.orban@gerad.ca). Research partially supported by an NSERC Discovery Grant.

<sup>‡</sup>Systems Optimization Laboratory, Department of Management Science and Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA. E-mail: [saunders@stanford.edu](mailto:saunders@stanford.edu). Version of October 4, 2023.

LSMR [4], which reduce  $\|r_k\|$  and  $\|A^T r_k\|$  respectively within the  $k$ th Krylov subspace  $\mathcal{K}_k(A^T A, A^T b)$  generated by the Golub-Kahan bidiagonalization on  $(A, b)$  [7].

For (1.1)–(1.5), we propose an algorithm MINARES that solves (1.6) by reducing  $\|Ar_k\|$  within the  $k$ th Krylov subspace  $\mathcal{K}_k(A, b)$  generated by the symmetric Lanczos process on  $(A, b)$  [11]. Thus when  $A$  is symmetric, MINARES minimizes the same quantity  $\|Ar_k\|$  as LSMR, but in different (more effective) subspaces, and it requires only one matrix-vector product  $Av$  per iteration, whereas LSMR would need two.

Qualitatively, certain residual norms decrease smoothly for these iterative methods, but other norms are more erratic as they approach zero. It is ideal if stopping criteria involve the smooth quantities. For LSQR and LSMR on general (possibly rectangular) systems,  $\|r_k\|$  decreases smoothly for both methods. We observe that while LSQR is always ahead by construction, it is never by very much. Thus on consistent systems  $Ax = b$ , LSQR may terminate slightly sooner. On inconsistent systems  $Ax \approx b$ , the comparison is more striking.  $\|A^T r_k\|$  decreases erratically for LSQR but smoothly for LSMR, and there is usually a significance difference between the two. Thus LSMR may terminate significantly sooner [4].

Similarly for MINRES [15] and MINARES,  $\|r_k\|$  decreases smoothly for both methods, and on consistent symmetric systems  $Ax = b$ , MINRES may have a small advantage. On inconsistent symmetric systems  $Ax \approx b$ ,  $\|Ar_k\|$  decreases erratically for MINRES and its variant MINRES-QLP [2] but smoothly for MINARES, and there is usually a significant difference between them. Thus MINARES may terminate sooner.

We introduce CAR, a new conjugate direction method similar to CG and CR and equivalent to MINARES when  $A$  is SPD. We prove that  $\|r_k\|$ ,  $\|x_k - x^*\|$  and  $\|x_k - x^*\|_A$  decrease monotonically for CAR and hence MINARES when  $A$  is positive definite.

**1.1. Notation.** A symmetric positive definite matrix is said to be SPD. For a vector  $v_k$ ,  $\|v_k\|$  denotes the Euclidean norm of  $v_k$ , and for an SPD matrix  $A$ , the  $A$ -norm of  $v_k$  is  $\|v_k\|_A^2 = v_k^T A v_k$ . For a matrix  $V_k$ ,  $\|V_k\|$  may be any norm. Vector  $e_j$  is the  $j$ th column of an identity matrix  $I_k$  of size dictated by the context. An approximate solution  $x_k$  has residual  $r_k = b - Ax_k$ , and  $x^*$  is the unique solution of  $Ax = b$  if  $A$  is nonsingular, or the minimum-norm solution of  $A^2 x = Ab$  otherwise.  $\mathcal{K}_k(A, b)$  is the *Krylov subspace*  $\{b, Ab, \dots, A^{k-1}b\}$ . We abusively write  $z = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n)$  to represent the column vector  $z = [\zeta_1 \ \dots \ \zeta_n]^T$ . If  $H$  is SPD and  $\{d_1, \dots, d_k\}$  is a set of non-zero vectors, the vectors are  $H$ -conjugate if  $d_i^T H d_j = 0$  for  $i \neq j$ . If  $H = I$ , conjugacy is equivalent to the usual notion of orthogonality.

## 2. Applications.

**2.1. Null vector, eigenvector, and singular value problems.** Given a symmetric  $A$  and nonzero  $b$ , MINARES solves  $A^2 x = Ab$  even if  $A$  is singular. If  $b$  is random and  $A$  is singular,  $r = b - Ax$  is unlikely to be zero, but it will be a nonzero nullvector of  $A$  because  $Ar = 0$ .

If an eigenvalue  $\lambda$  of  $A$  is known, we can use it as a shift in the Lanczos process with a random starting vector  $b$  to find a null vector  $r$  such that  $(A - \lambda I)r = 0$ . Then  $r$  is an eigenvector because  $Ar = \lambda r$ . MINARES is effectively implementing the inverse power method [8, 18] to obtain the eigenvector in one iteration. If  $\lambda$  is approximate, MINARES can implement Rayleigh quotient iteration [8, 18] to obtain increasingly accurate eigenpair estimates.

Similarly, if a singular value  $\sigma$  is known for a rectangular matrix  $B$ , the singular value problem  $Bv = \sigma u$ ,  $B^T u = \sigma v$  may be reformulated as a null vector problem or

**Algorithm 3.1** Lanczos process**Require:**  $A, b$ 


---

```

1:  $v_0 = 0$ 
2:  $\beta_1 v_1 = b$   $\beta_1 > 0$  so that  $\|v_1\| = 1$ 
3: for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  do
4:    $q_k = Av_k - \beta_k v_{k-1}$ 
5:    $\alpha_k = v_k^T q_k$ 
6:    $q_k = q_k - \alpha_k v_k$ 
7:    $\beta_{k+1} = \|q_k\|$ 
8:   if  $\beta_{k+1} = 0$  then
9:      $\ell = k$ ; return  $\ell$ 
10:  else
11:     $v_{k+1} = q_k / \beta_{k+1}$   $\beta_{k+1} > 0$  so that  $\|v_{k+1}\| = 1$ 
12:  end if
13: end for

```

---

eigenvalue problem:

$$\left( \begin{bmatrix} & B \\ B^T & \end{bmatrix} - \sigma I \right) \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix} = 0 \iff \begin{bmatrix} & B \\ B^T & \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix} = \sigma \begin{bmatrix} u \\ v \end{bmatrix},$$

for which MINARES may be used to implement inverse iteration or Rayleigh quotient iteration (although an algorithm based on the Golub-Kahan bidiagonalization of  $B$  would be preferable).

**2.2. Singular systems with semi-positive definite matrices.** Inconsistent (singular) symmetric systems could arise from discretized semidefinite Neumann boundary value problems [10, sect. 4]. Measurement errors will be random, so  $b$  is unlikely to be in the range of singular  $A$ .

Another potential application is large, singular, symmetric, indefinite Toeplitz least-squares problems as described in [6, sec. 5]. Rank-deficient Toeplitz matrices arise in image reconstruction and system identification problems. In both cases,  $A$  is a semi-positive definite matrix and MINARES is a suitable solver.

**3. Symmetric systems.** With  $A$  symmetric and starting vector  $b$ , we make use of the symmetric Lanczos process [11] of Algorithm 3.1. After  $k$  iterations the situation may be summarized as

$$(3.1a) \quad AV_k = V_k T_k + \beta_{k+1} v_{k+1} e_k^T = V_{k+1} T_{k+1,k},$$

$$(3.1b) \quad V_k^T V_k = I_k,$$

where

$$V_k := [v_1 \quad \dots \quad v_k], \quad T_k = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1 & \beta_2 & & & \\ \beta_2 & \alpha_2 & \ddots & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & \beta_k & \alpha_k \\ & & & & \alpha_k \end{bmatrix}, \quad T_{k+1,k} = \begin{bmatrix} T_k \\ \beta_{k+1} e_k^T \end{bmatrix}.$$

In exact arithmetic,  $V_k$  is an orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{K}_k(A, b)$ . The Lanczos process terminates after  $\ell \leq n$  iterations when  $\beta_{\ell+1} = 0$ , and we then have  $AV_\ell = V_\ell T_\ell$ , where square  $T_\ell$  is nonsingular if and only if  $b \in \text{range}(A)$  [2, sec. 2.1 property 4].  $T_{k+1,k}$  has

full column rank  $k$  for all  $k < \ell$  [2, sec. 2.1 property 2] and the rank of  $T_\ell$  is  $\ell$  or  $\ell - 1$  but no less (because the first  $\ell - 1$  columns of  $T_\ell$  are independent).

In finite arithmetic, (3.1a) holds to machine precision. Reorthogonalization would be needed for (3.1b) to hold accurately, but it is enough to note that we always have  $\|V_k\| = O(1)$ .

**3.1. CG, SYMMLQ, MINRES, MINARES.** As with CG [9], SYMMLQ [15], and MINRES [15], the goal of MINARES is to solve symmetric problems  $Ax \approx b$ . All methods define an approximate solution  $x_k = V_k y_k$  at iteration  $k$  (where  $y_k$  is different for each method). MINARES chooses  $y_k$  to minimize  $\|Ar_k\|$  in  $\mathcal{K}_k(A, b)$ , so that  $\|Ar_k\|$  is monotonically decreasing towards zero. MINARES is therefore well suited to singular inconsistent symmetric systems. This case is difficult for the other methods because  $\|x_k - x^*\|_A$ ,  $\|x_k - x^*\|$  and  $\|r_k\|$  do not converge to zero and they are the quantities minimized respectively by CG, SYMMLQ, and both MINRES and MINRES-QLP.

#### 4. Derivation of MINARES.

**4.1. Subproblems of MINARES.** From Algorithm 3.1 we have  $Ab = \beta_1 \alpha_1 v_1 + \beta_1 \beta_2 v_2$  because  $\beta_2 v_2 = Av_1 - \alpha_1 v_1$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} Ar_k &= A(b - AV_k y_k) \\ &= Ab - AV_{k+1} T_{k+1,k} y_k \\ &= \beta_1 \alpha_1 v_1 + \beta_1 \beta_2 v_2 - V_{k+2} T_{k+2,k+1} T_{k+1,k} y_k \\ (4.1a) \quad &= V_{k+2} (\beta_1 \alpha_1 e_1 + \beta_1 \beta_2 e_2 - T_{k+2,k+1} T_{k+1,k} y_k), \quad k \leq \ell - 2, \end{aligned}$$

$$(4.1b) \quad Ar_{\ell-1} = V_\ell (\beta_1 \alpha_1 e_1 + \beta_1 \beta_2 e_2 - T_\ell T_{\ell,\ell-1} y_{\ell-1}),$$

$$(4.1c) \quad Ar_\ell = V_\ell (\beta_1 \alpha_1 e_1 + \beta_1 \beta_2 e_2 - T_\ell^2 y_\ell).$$

Theoretically,  $V_k$  has orthonormal columns ( $1 \leq k \leq \ell$ ), so that  $\|x_k\| = \|y_k\|$  and  $\|Ar_k\|$  is minimized with  $\|x_k\|$  of minimal norm if we define  $y_k$  as the unique solution of the following subproblems:

$$(4.2a) \quad \underset{y_k \in \mathbb{R}^k}{\text{minimize}} \quad \|T_{k+2,k+1} T_{k+1,k} y_k - \beta_1 \alpha_1 e_1 - \beta_1 \beta_2 e_2\|, \quad k \leq \ell - 2,$$

$$(4.2b) \quad \underset{y_{\ell-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell-1}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \|T_\ell T_{\ell,\ell-1} y_{\ell-1} - \beta_1 \alpha_1 e_1 - \beta_1 \beta_2 e_2\|,$$

$$(4.2c) \quad \underset{y_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^\ell}{\text{minimize}} \quad \|y_\ell\|^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad T_\ell^2 y_\ell = \beta_1 \alpha_1 e_1 + \beta_1 \beta_2 e_2.$$

We define  $y_k$  from these subproblems even though  $V_k$  does not remain orthonormal numerically. In practice, we expect  $\|Ar_k\| \leq \|Ar_{k-1}\|$  unless  $k$  becomes too large.

To be sure that the subproblems have unique solutions, we need to verify that  $T_{k+2,k+1} T_{k+1,k}$  has rank  $k$  ( $k \leq \ell - 2$ ),  $T_\ell T_{\ell,\ell-1}$  has rank  $\ell - 1$ , and  $T_\ell^2 y_\ell = \beta_1 \alpha_1 e_1 + \beta_1 \beta_2 e_2$  is consistent even if  $T_\ell$  is singular. These results are proved in Theorem 4.1, Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.3.

**THEOREM 4.1.** *For  $k \leq \ell - 2$ ,  $T_{k+2,k+1} T_{k+1,k}$  has rank  $k$ .*

See proof on page 15.

**THEOREM 4.2.**  *$T_\ell T_{\ell,\ell-1}$  has rank  $\ell - 1$ .*

See proof on page 16.

**THEOREM 4.3.**  *$T_\ell^2 y_\ell = \beta_1 \alpha_1 e_1 + \beta_1 \beta_2 e_2$  is consistent even if  $T_\ell$  is singular.*



Because  $Q_k = Q_{2,1}Q_{3,2}\dots Q_{k+1,k}$ , we have

$$(4.7a) \quad e_k^T Q_k = e_k^T Q_{k,k-1} Q_{k+1,k} = s_{k-1} e_{k-1}^T - c_{k-1} c_k e_k^T - c_{k-1} s_k e_{k+1}^T,$$

$$(4.7b) \quad e_{k+1}^T Q_k = e_{k+1}^T Q_{k+1,k} = s_k e_k^T - c_k e_{k+1}^T.$$

Moreover,  $T_{k+2,k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} T_{k+1,k}^T \\ \beta_{k+1} e_k^T + \alpha_{k+1} e_{k+1}^T \\ \beta_{k+2} e_{k+1}^T \end{bmatrix}$  and the product  $T_{k+2,k+1} Q_k$  can be determined in three parts. From (4.3),  $T_{k+1,k}^T Q_k = (Q_k^T T_{k+1,k})^T = [R_k^T \ 0]$ , and from (4.7) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\beta_{k+1} e_k^T + \alpha_{k+1} e_{k+1}^T) Q_k &= \beta_{k+1} s_{k-1} e_{k-1}^T + (\alpha_{k+1} s_k - \beta_{k+1} c_{k-1} s_k) e_k^T \\ &\quad - (\alpha_{k+1} c_k + \beta_{k+1} c_{k-1} s_k) e_{k+1}^T \\ &= \varepsilon_{k-1} e_{k-1}^T + \gamma_k e_k^T - (\alpha_{k+1} c_k + \beta_{k+1} c_{k-1} s_k) e_{k+1}^T, \\ \beta_{k+2} e_{k+1}^T Q_k &= s_k \beta_{k+2} e_k^T - c_k \beta_{k+2} e_{k+1}^T \\ &= \varepsilon_k e_k^T - c_k \beta_{k+2} e_{k+1}^T. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for  $k \leq \ell - 2$  we obtain

$$(4.8) \quad N_k = \begin{bmatrix} R_k^T \\ \varepsilon_{k-1} e_{k-1}^T + \gamma_k e_k^T \\ \varepsilon_k e_k^T \end{bmatrix}, \quad N_{\ell-1} = \begin{bmatrix} R_{\ell-1}^T \\ \varepsilon_{\ell-1} e_{\ell-1}^T + \gamma_\ell e_\ell^T \end{bmatrix}, \quad N_\ell = R_\ell^T.$$

#### 4.4. QR factorization of $N_k$ .

$$(4.9) \quad N_k = \tilde{Q}_k \begin{bmatrix} U_k \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad U_k = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 & \phi_1 & \rho_1 & & & \\ & \mu_2 & \phi_2 & \ddots & & \\ & & \mu_3 & \ddots & \rho_{k-2} & \\ & & & \ddots & \phi_{k-1} & \\ & & & & & \mu_k \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $\tilde{Q}_k^T = \tilde{Q}_{k+2,k} \tilde{Q}_{k+1,k} \dots \tilde{Q}_{3,1} \tilde{Q}_{2,1}$  for  $k \leq \ell - 2$ , and  $\tilde{Q}_\ell^T = \tilde{Q}_{\ell-1}^T = \tilde{Q}_{\ell,\ell-1} \tilde{Q}_{\ell-2}^T$  are orthogonal matrices defined as a product of reflections. If we initialize  $\bar{\mu}_1 := \lambda_1$ ,  $\hat{\gamma}_1 := \gamma_1$  and  $\hat{\lambda}_2 := \lambda_2$ , individual factorization steps may be represented as an application of  $\tilde{Q}_{k+1,k}$  to  $\tilde{Q}_{k-1}^T N_k$ :

$$\begin{array}{c} k \\ k+1 \\ k+2 \end{array} \begin{bmatrix} k & k+1 & k+2 \\ \tilde{c}_{2k-1} & \tilde{s}_{2k-1} & \\ \tilde{s}_{2k-1} & -\tilde{c}_{2k-1} & \\ & & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} k & k+1 & k+2 \\ \bar{\mu}_k & & \\ \hat{\gamma}_k & \hat{\lambda}_{k+1} & \\ \varepsilon_k & \gamma_{k+1} & \lambda_{k+2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} k & k+1 & k+2 \\ \bar{\mu}_k & \bar{\phi}_k & \\ \varepsilon_k & \bar{\mu}_{k+1} & \lambda_{k+2} \end{bmatrix},$$

followed by an application of  $Q_{k+2,k}$  to the result:

$$\begin{array}{c} k \\ k+1 \\ k+2 \end{array} \begin{bmatrix} k & k+1 & k+2 \\ \tilde{c}_{2k} & & \tilde{s}_{2k} \\ & 1 & \\ \tilde{s}_{2k} & & -\tilde{c}_{2k} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} k & k+1 & k+2 \\ \bar{\mu}_k & \bar{\phi}_k & \\ \varepsilon_k & \gamma_{k+1} & \lambda_{k+2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} k & k+1 & k+2 \\ \mu_k & \phi_k & \rho_k \\ & \bar{\mu}_{k+1} & \\ & \hat{\gamma}_{k+1} & \hat{\lambda}_{k+2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The reflections  $\tilde{Q}_{k+1,k}$  and  $\tilde{Q}_{k+2,k}$  zero  $\gamma_k$  and  $\varepsilon_k$  on the subdiagonals of  $N_k$ :

$$(4.10a) \quad \bar{\mu}_k = \sqrt{\bar{\mu}_k^2 + \hat{\gamma}_k^2}, \quad \tilde{c}_{2k-1} = \bar{\mu}_k / \bar{\mu}_k, \quad \tilde{s}_{2k-1} = \hat{\gamma}_k / \bar{\mu}_k, \quad k \leq \ell - 1,$$

$$(4.10b) \quad \mu_k = \sqrt{\bar{\mu}_k^2 + \varepsilon_k^2}, \quad \tilde{c}_{2k} = \bar{\mu}_k / \mu_k, \quad \tilde{s}_{2k} = \varepsilon_k / \mu_k, \quad k \leq \ell - 2,$$

and they yield the recursion

$$(4.11a) \quad \bar{\phi}_k = \tilde{s}_{2k-1} \hat{\lambda}_{k+1}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq \ell - 1,$$

$$(4.11b) \quad \bar{\mu}_{k+1} = -\tilde{c}_{2k-1} \hat{\lambda}_{k+1}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq \ell - 1,$$

$$(4.11c) \quad \phi_k = \tilde{c}_{2k} \bar{\phi}_k + \tilde{s}_{2k} \gamma_{k+1}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq \ell - 2,$$

$$(4.11d) \quad \hat{\gamma}_{k+1} = \tilde{s}_{2k} \bar{\phi}_k - \tilde{c}_{2k} \gamma_{k+1}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq \ell - 2,$$

$$(4.11e) \quad \rho_k = \tilde{s}_{2k} \lambda_{k+2}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq \ell - 2,$$

$$(4.11f) \quad \hat{\lambda}_{k+2} = -\tilde{c}_{2k} \lambda_{k+2}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq \ell - 2,$$

$$(4.11g) \quad \mu_{\ell-1} = \bar{\mu}_{\ell-1},$$

$$(4.11h) \quad \phi_{\ell-1} = \bar{\phi}_{\ell-1},$$

$$(4.11i) \quad \mu_\ell = \bar{\mu}_\ell.$$

From (4.1) and (4.9) we have

$$(4.12) \quad \|Ar_k\| = \|N_k R_k y_k - \beta_1 \alpha_1 e_1 - \beta_1 \beta_2 e_2\| = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} U_k \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} R_k y_k - \bar{z}_k \right\|,$$

where  $\bar{z}_k := \tilde{Q}_k^T (\beta_1 \alpha_1 e_1 + \beta_1 \beta_2 e_2) = (z_k, \bar{\zeta}_{k+1}, \bar{\zeta}_{k+2})$ ,  $k \leq \ell - 2$ ,  $z_k = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_k)$  represents the first  $k$  components of  $\bar{z}_k$ , and the recurrence starts with  $\bar{z}_0 := (\bar{\zeta}_1, \bar{\zeta}_2) = (\beta_1 \alpha_1, \beta_1 \beta_2)$ . We can determine  $\bar{z}_k$  from  $\bar{z}_{k-1}$  because  $\bar{z}_k = \tilde{Q}_{k+2,k} \tilde{Q}_{k+1,k} (\bar{z}_{k-1}, 0)$  for  $k \leq \ell - 2$ :

$$\begin{array}{c} k & k+1 & k+2 \\ k & \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{c}_{2k} & & \\ & 1 & \\ \tilde{s}_{2k} & & -\tilde{c}_{2k} \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} k & k+1 & k+2 \\ \tilde{c}_{2k-1} & \tilde{s}_{2k-1} & \\ \tilde{s}_{2k-1} & -\tilde{c}_{2k-1} & 1 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\zeta}_k \\ \bar{\zeta}_{k+1} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{array} = \begin{bmatrix} \zeta_k \\ \bar{\zeta}_{k+1} \\ \bar{\zeta}_{k+2} \end{bmatrix},$$

and  $z_\ell = z_{\ell-1} = \tilde{Q}_{\ell,\ell-1} \bar{z}_{\ell-2}$ . The elements are updated according to

$$(4.13a) \quad \dot{\zeta}_k = \tilde{c}_{2k-1} \bar{\zeta}_k + \tilde{s}_{2k-1} \bar{\zeta}_{k+1}, \quad k \leq \ell - 1,$$

$$(4.13b) \quad \bar{\zeta}_{k+1} = \tilde{s}_{2k-1} \bar{\zeta}_k - \tilde{c}_{2k-1} \bar{\zeta}_{k+1}, \quad k \leq \ell - 1,$$

$$(4.13c) \quad \zeta_k = \tilde{c}_{2k} \dot{\zeta}_k, \quad k \leq \ell - 2,$$

$$(4.13d) \quad \bar{\zeta}_{k+2} = \tilde{s}_{2k} \dot{\zeta}_k, \quad k \leq \ell - 2,$$

$$(4.13e) \quad \zeta_{\ell-1} = \dot{\zeta}_{\ell-1},$$

$$(4.13f) \quad \zeta_\ell = \bar{\zeta}_\ell.$$

For  $k \leq \ell - 1$ ,  $U_k$  and  $R_k$  are nonsingular, and from (4.12),  $\|Ar_k\|$  is minimized when  $U_k R_k y_k = z_k$ , giving

$$(4.14) \quad \|Ar_k\| = \sqrt{\bar{\zeta}_{k+1}^2 + \bar{\zeta}_{k+2}^2}, \quad k \leq \ell - 2, \quad \|Ar_{\ell-1}\| = |\zeta_\ell|.$$





**Algorithm 4.1** MINARES

---

**Require:**  $A, b, \epsilon_r > 0, \epsilon_{Ar} > 0, k_{\max} > 0$

- 1:  $k = 0, x_0 = 0$
- 2:  $w_{-1} = w_0 = 0, d_{-1} = d_0 = 0$
- 3:  $\varepsilon_{-1} = \varepsilon_0 = \gamma_0 = 0, \rho_{-1} = \rho_0 = \phi_0 = 0$
- 4:  $\beta_1 v_1 = b, q_1 = Av_1, \alpha_1 = v_1^T q_1$
- 5:  $\underline{q}_1 = q_1 - \alpha_1 v_1, \beta_2 v_2 = \underline{q}_1$
- 6:  $\underline{\zeta}_1 = \beta_1 \alpha_1, \underline{\zeta}_2 = \beta_1 \beta_2$
- 7:  $\bar{\chi}_1 = \beta_1, \bar{\lambda}_1 = \alpha_1, \bar{\gamma}_1 = \beta_2$
- 8:  $\|r_0\| = \bar{\chi}_1, \|Ar_0\| = (\bar{\zeta}_1^2 + \bar{\zeta}_2^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$
- 9: **while**  $\|r_k\| > \epsilon_r$  **and**  $\|Ar_k\| > \epsilon_{Ar}$  **and**  $k \leq k_{\max}$  **do**
- 10:      $k \leftarrow k + 1$
- 11:      $q_{k+1} = Av_{k+1} - \beta_{k+1} v_k, \alpha_{k+1} = v_{k+1}^T q_{k+1}$
- 12:      $q_{k+1} = q_{k+1} - \alpha_{k+1} v_{k+1}, \beta_{k+2} v_{k+2} = q_{k+1}$
- 13:      $\lambda_k = (\bar{\lambda}_k^2 + \beta_{k+1}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, c_k = \bar{\lambda}_k / \lambda_k, s_k = \beta_{k+1} / \lambda_k$
- 14:      $\gamma_k = c_k \bar{\gamma}_k + s_k \alpha_{k+1}, \varepsilon_k = s_k \beta_{k+2}$
- 15:      $\bar{\lambda}_{k+1} = s_k \bar{\gamma}_k - c_k \alpha_{k+1}, \bar{\gamma}_{k+1} = -c_k \beta_{k+2}$
- 16:     **if**  $k == 1$  **then**
- 17:          $\bar{\mu}_k = \lambda_k, \hat{\gamma}_k = \gamma_k$
- 18:     **else**
- 19:         **if**  $k == 2$  **then**
- 20:              $\hat{\lambda}_k = \lambda_k$
- 21:         **else**
- 22:              $\rho_{k-2} = \tilde{s}_{2k-4} \lambda_k, \hat{\lambda}_k = -\tilde{c}_{2k-4} \lambda_k$
- 23:         **end if**
- 24:          $\bar{\phi}_{k-1} = \tilde{s}_{2k-3} \hat{\lambda}_k, \phi_{k-1} = \tilde{c}_{2k-2} \bar{\phi}_{k-1} + \tilde{s}_{2k-2} \gamma_k$
- 25:          $\bar{\mu}_k = -\tilde{c}_{2k-3} \hat{\lambda}_k, \hat{\gamma}_k = \tilde{s}_{2k-2} \bar{\phi}_{k-1} - \tilde{c}_{2k-2} \gamma_k$
- 26:         **end if**
- 27:          $\bar{\mu}_k = (\bar{\mu}_k^2 + \hat{\gamma}_k^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tilde{c}_{2k-1} = \bar{\mu}_k / \bar{\mu}_k, \tilde{s}_{2k-1} = \hat{\gamma}_k / \bar{\mu}_k$
- 28:          $\mu_k = (\bar{\mu}_k^2 + \varepsilon_k^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tilde{c}_{2k} = \bar{\mu}_k / \mu_k, \tilde{s}_{2k} = \varepsilon_k / \mu_k$
- 29:          $\zeta_k = \tilde{c}_{2k-1} \bar{\zeta}_k + \tilde{s}_{2k-1} \bar{\zeta}_{k+1}, \zeta_k = \tilde{c}_{2k} \hat{\zeta}_k$
- 30:          $\bar{\zeta}_{k+1} = \tilde{s}_{2k-1} \bar{\zeta}_k - \tilde{c}_{2k-1} \bar{\zeta}_{k+1}, \bar{\zeta}_{k+2} = \tilde{s}_{2k} \hat{\zeta}_k$
- 31:          $w_k = (v_k - \gamma_{k-1} w_{k-1} - \varepsilon_{k-2} w_{k-2}) / \lambda_k$
- 32:          $d_k = (w_k - \phi_{k-1} d_{k-1} - \rho_{k-2} d_{k-2}) / \mu_k$
- 33:          $x_k = x_{k-1} + \zeta_k d_k$
- 34:          $\|Ar_k\| = (\bar{\zeta}_{k+1}^2 + \zeta_{k+2}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$

---

where  $\hat{P}_1^T = I, \hat{P}_2^T = \hat{P}_{1,2}$ , and  $\hat{P}_k^T = \hat{P}_{k-1}^T \hat{P}_{k-2,k} \hat{P}_{k-1,k}$  ( $k \geq 3$ ) are orthogonal. Note that  $\hat{L}_k$  is the L factor of a QLP decomposition of  $N_k$ . If we initialize  $\bar{\psi}_1 := \mu_1, \hat{P}_{1,2}$  is defined to zero  $\phi_1$ :

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{\psi}_1 & \phi_1 \\ & \mu_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{c}_1 & \hat{s}_1 \\ \hat{s}_1 & -\hat{c}_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\psi}_1 & \\ \bar{\theta}_1 & \bar{\psi}_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$(5.2) \quad \bar{\psi}_1 = \sqrt{\bar{\psi}_1^2 + \phi_1^2}, \quad \hat{c}_1 = \bar{\psi}_1 / \bar{\psi}_1, \quad \hat{s}_1 = \phi_1 / \bar{\psi}_1, \quad \bar{\theta}_1 = \hat{s}_1 \mu_2, \quad \bar{\psi}_2 = -\hat{c}_1 \mu_2.$$

---

```

35:  $\chi_k = c_k \bar{\chi}_k, \bar{\chi}_{k+1} = s_k \bar{\chi}_k$ 
36: if  $k == 1$  then
37:    $\bar{\psi}_k = \mu_k, \bar{\pi}_{k-1} = 0, \bar{\pi}_k = \bar{\chi}_k$ 
38:    $\xi_k = \zeta_k, \bar{\tau}_{k-1} = 0, \bar{\tau}_k = \xi_k / \bar{\psi}_k$ 
39: else if  $k == 2$  then
40:    $\bar{\psi}_{k-1} = (\bar{\psi}_{k-1}^2 + \phi_{k-1}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \hat{c}_{k-1} = \bar{\psi}_{k-1} / \bar{\psi}_{k-1}, \hat{s}_{k-1} = \phi_{k-1} / \bar{\psi}_{k-1}$ 
41:    $\hat{\theta}_{k-1} = \hat{s}_{2k-3} \mu_k, \bar{\psi}_k = -\hat{c}_{2k-3} \mu_k$ 
42:    $\bar{\pi}_{k-1} = \hat{c}_{2k-3} \bar{\pi}_{k-1} + \hat{s}_{2k-3} \chi_k, \bar{\pi}_k = \hat{s}_{2k-3} \bar{\pi}_{k-1} - \hat{c}_{2k-3} \chi_k$ 
43:    $\xi_k = \zeta_k, \bar{\tau}_{k-1} = \xi_{k-1} / \bar{\psi}_{k-1}, \bar{\tau}_k = (\xi_k - \hat{\theta}_{k-1} \bar{\tau}_{k-1}) / \bar{\psi}_k$ 
44: else
45:    $\psi_{k-2} = (\bar{\psi}_{k-2}^2 + \rho_{k-2}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \hat{c}_{2k-4} = \bar{\psi}_{k-2} / \psi_{k-2}, \hat{s}_{2k-4} = \rho_{k-2} / \psi_{k-2}$ 
46:    $\bar{\psi}_{k-1} = (\bar{\psi}_{k-1}^2 + \delta_k^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \hat{c}_{2k-3} = \bar{\psi}_{k-1} / \bar{\psi}_{k-1}, \hat{s}_{2k-3} = \delta_k / \bar{\psi}_{k-1}$ 
47:    $\theta_{k-2} = \hat{c}_{2k-4} \hat{\theta}_{k-2} + \hat{s}_{2k-4} \phi_{k-1}, \omega_{k-2} = \hat{s}_{2k-4} \mu_k$ 
48:    $\delta_k = \hat{s}_{2k-4} \hat{\theta}_{k-2} - \hat{c}_{2k-4} \phi_{k-1}, \eta_k = -\hat{c}_{2k-4} \mu_k$ 
49:    $\theta_{k-1} = \hat{s}_{2k-3} \eta_k, \bar{\psi}_k = -\hat{c}_{2k-3} \eta_k, \nu_k = \hat{s}_{2k-4} \bar{\pi}_{k-2} - \hat{c}_{2k-4} \chi_k$ 
50:    $\bar{\pi}_{k-1} = \hat{c}_{2k-3} \bar{\pi}_{k-1} + \hat{s}_{2k-3} \nu_k, \bar{\pi}_k = \hat{s}_{2k-3} \bar{\pi}_{k-1} - \hat{c}_{2k-3} \nu_k$ 
51:    $\tau_{k-2} = \bar{\tau}_{k-2} \bar{\psi}_{k-2} / \psi_{k-2}, \xi_k = \zeta_k - \omega_{k-2} \tau_{k-2}$ 
52:    $\bar{\tau}_{k-1} = (\xi_{k-1} - \theta_{k-2} \tau_{k-2}) / \bar{\psi}_{k-1}, \bar{\tau}_k = (\xi_k - \hat{\theta}_{k-1} \bar{\tau}_{k-1}) / \bar{\psi}_k$ 
53: end if
54:  $\|r_k\| = ((\bar{\pi}_{k-1} - \bar{\tau}_{k-1})^2 + (\bar{\pi}_k - \bar{\tau}_k)^2 + \bar{\chi}_{k+1}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ 
55: end while

```

---

For  $k \geq 3$ , individual factorization steps may be represented as an application of  $\hat{P}_{k-2,k}$  to  $U_k \hat{P}_{k-1}^T$ :

$$\begin{array}{c}
k-2 \\
k-1 \\
k
\end{array}
\begin{bmatrix}
k-2 & k-1 & k \\
\bar{\psi}_{k-2} & & \rho_{k-2} \\
\hat{\theta}_{k-2} & \bar{\psi}_{k-1} & \phi_{k-1} \\
& & \mu_k
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
k-2 & k-1 & k \\
\hat{c}_{2k-4} & & \hat{s}_{2k-4} \\
& 1 & \\
\hat{s}_{2k-4} & & -\hat{c}_{2k-4}
\end{bmatrix}
=
\begin{bmatrix}
k-2 & k-1 & k \\
\psi_{k-2} & & \\
\theta_{k-2} & \bar{\psi}_{k-1} & \delta_k \\
\omega_{k-2} & & \eta_k
\end{bmatrix},$$

followed by an application of  $\hat{P}_{k-1,k}$  to the result:

$$\begin{array}{c}
k-2 \\
k-1 \\
k
\end{array}
\begin{bmatrix}
k-2 & k-1 & k \\
\psi_{k-2} & & \\
\theta_{k-2} & \bar{\psi}_{k-1} & \delta_k \\
\omega_{k-2} & & \eta_k
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
k-2 & k-1 & k \\
1 & & \\
& \hat{c}_{2k-3} & \hat{s}_{2k-3} \\
& \hat{s}_{2k-3} & -\hat{c}_{2k-3}
\end{bmatrix}
=
\begin{bmatrix}
k-2 & k-1 & k \\
\psi_{k-2} & & \\
\theta_{k-2} & \bar{\psi}_{k-1} & \\
\omega_{k-2} & \hat{\theta}_{k-1} & \bar{\psi}_k
\end{bmatrix}.$$

The reflections  $\hat{P}_{k-2,k}$  and  $\hat{P}_{k-1,k}$  zero  $\rho_{k-2}$  and  $\delta_k$  on the superdiagonals of  $U_k$ :

$$(5.3a) \quad \psi_{k-2} = \sqrt{\bar{\psi}_{k-2}^2 + \rho_{k-2}^2}, \quad \hat{c}_{2k-4} = \bar{\psi}_{k-2} / \psi_{k-2}, \quad \hat{s}_{2k-4} = \rho_{k-2} / \psi_{k-2},$$

$$(5.3b) \quad \bar{\psi}_{k-1} = \sqrt{\bar{\psi}_{k-1}^2 + \delta_k^2}, \quad \hat{c}_{2k-3} = \bar{\psi}_{k-1} / \bar{\psi}_{k-1}, \quad \hat{s}_{2k-3} = \delta_k / \bar{\psi}_{k-1},$$

and for  $k \geq 3$  they yield the recursion

$$(5.4a) \quad \theta_{k-2} = \hat{c}_{2k-4} \bar{\theta}_{k-2} + \hat{s}_{2k-4} \phi_{k-1},$$

$$(5.4b) \quad \delta_k = \hat{s}_{2k-4} \bar{\theta}_{k-2} - \hat{c}_{2k-4} \phi_{k-1},$$

$$(5.4c) \quad \omega_{k-2} = \hat{s}_{2k-4} \mu_k,$$

$$(5.4d) \quad \eta_k = -\hat{c}_{2k-4} \mu_k,$$

$$(5.4e) \quad \bar{\theta}_{k-1} = \hat{s}_{2k-3} \eta_k,$$

$$(5.4f) \quad \bar{\psi}_k = -\hat{c}_{2k-3} \eta_k.$$

Assuming orthonormality of  $V_{k+1}$ , we have

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \|r_k\| &= \|\beta_1 e_1 - T_{k+1,k} y_k\| = \left\| Q_k^T \beta_1 e_1 - \begin{bmatrix} R_k \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} y_k \right\| \\ &= \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \hat{P}_k \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} Q_k^T \beta_1 e_1 - \begin{bmatrix} \hat{P}_k R_k y_k \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\| \\ &= \left\| p_{k+1} - \begin{bmatrix} t_k \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\|, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(5.6a) \quad (\chi_1, \dots, \chi_k, \bar{\chi}_{k+1}) := Q_k^T \beta_1 e_1,$$

$$(5.6b) \quad p_{k+1} := (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{k-2}, \bar{\pi}_{k-1}, \bar{\pi}_k, \bar{\chi}_{k+1}) = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{P}_k \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} Q_k^T \beta_1 e_1,$$

$$(5.6c) \quad t_k := (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{k-2}, \bar{\tau}_{k-1}, \bar{\tau}_k) \text{ solves } \hat{L}_k t_k = z_k.$$

The components of  $Q_k^T \beta_1 e_1$  can be updated with the relations

$$(5.7) \quad \bar{\chi}_1 = \beta_1, \quad \chi_k = c_k \bar{\chi}_k, \quad \bar{\chi}_{k+1} = s_k \bar{\chi}_k,$$

the components of  $p_{k+1}$  are updated with

$$(5.8a) \quad \bar{\pi}_1 = \chi_1,$$

$$(5.8b) \quad v_2 = \chi_2,$$

$$(5.8c) \quad \pi_{k-2} = \hat{c}_{2k-4} \bar{\pi}_{k-2} + \hat{s}_{2k-4} \chi_k, \quad k \geq 3,$$

$$(5.8d) \quad v_k = \hat{s}_{2k-4} \bar{\pi}_{k-2} - \hat{c}_{2k-4} \chi_k, \quad k \geq 3,$$

$$(5.8e) \quad \bar{\pi}_{k-1} = \hat{c}_{2k-3} \bar{\pi}_{k-1} + \hat{s}_{2k-3} v_k, \quad k \geq 2,$$

$$(5.8f) \quad \bar{\pi}_k = \hat{s}_{2k-3} \bar{\pi}_{k-1} - \hat{c}_{2k-3} v_k, \quad k \geq 2,$$

and with  $\omega_{-1} = \omega_0 = \theta_0 = \bar{\theta}_0 = 0$  the components of  $t_k$  are updated with

$$(5.9a) \quad \xi_k = \zeta_k - \omega_{k-2} \tau_{k-2},$$

$$(5.9b) \quad \bar{\tau}_k = (\xi_k - \bar{\theta}_{k-1} \bar{\tau}_{k-1}) / \bar{\psi}_k,$$

$$(5.9c) \quad \bar{\tau}_k = (\xi_k - \theta_{k-1} \tau_{k-1}) / \bar{\psi}_k,$$

$$(5.9d) \quad \tau_k = \bar{\tau}_k \bar{\psi}_k / \psi_k.$$

Using [Lemma 5.1](#) we can estimate  $\|r_k\|$  from the last three elements of  $p_{k+1}$  and the last two of  $t_k$ :

$$(5.10a) \quad \|r_1\| = \sqrt{(\bar{\pi}_1^2 - \bar{\tau}_1^2) + \bar{\chi}_2^2},$$

$$(5.10b) \quad \|r_k\| = \sqrt{(\bar{\pi}_{k-1} - \bar{\tau}_{k-1})^2 + (\bar{\pi}_k - \bar{\tau}_k)^2 + \bar{\chi}_{k+1}^2}, \quad k \geq 2.$$

LEMMA 5.1. In (5.5),  $\pi_i = \tau_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k-2$ .

See proof on page 17.

**5.2. Estimating  $\|Ar_k\|$ .** From (4.14) we have

$$(5.11) \quad \|Ar_k\| = \sqrt{\bar{\zeta}_{k+1}^2 + \bar{\zeta}_{k+2}^2}, \quad k \leq \ell - 2, \quad \|Ar_{\ell-1}\| = |\zeta_\ell|.$$

**6. CAR.** We now introduce CAR, a conjugate direction method in the vein of CG and CR of Hestenes and Stiefel [9, 17] for solving  $Ax = b$  when  $A$  is SPD. By design, CAR is equivalent to MINARES in exact arithmetic as both methods minimize the same quantities in the same subspace, and generate the same iterates. The name CAR stems from the property that successive A-residuals are conjugate with respect to  $A$ . The three methods generate sequences of approximate solutions  $x_k$  in the Krylov subspaces  $\mathcal{K}_k(A, b)$  by minimizing a quadratic function  $f(x)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\text{CG}}(x) &= \frac{1}{2}x^T Ax - b^T x, & \nabla f_{\text{CG}}(x) &= -r, & \nabla^2 f_{\text{CG}}(x) &= A, \\ f_{\text{CR}}(x) &= \frac{1}{2}\|Ax - b\|^2, & \nabla f_{\text{CR}}(x) &= -Ar, & \nabla^2 f_{\text{CR}}(x) &= A^2, \\ f_{\text{CAR}}(x) &= \frac{1}{2}\|A^2 x - Ab\|^2, & \nabla f_{\text{CAR}}(x) &= -A^3 r, & \nabla^2 f_{\text{CAR}}(x) &= A^4. \end{aligned}$$

Note that all three quadratic functions satisfy  $A\nabla f(x) = -\nabla^2 f(x)r$ , where  $r = b - Ax$ . Because CAR minimizes  $\|Ar_k\|$  in  $\mathcal{K}_k(A, b)$ , it is an alternative version of MINARES restricted to SPD  $A$ . We can derive it as a descent method with exact linesearch. From initial vectors  $x_0 = 0$  and  $r_0 = p_0 = b$ , we update the iterates with  $x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k p_k$ . From the Taylor expansion, we can determine  $\alpha_k$  that minimizes  $f(x_k + \alpha p_k)$ :

$$f(x_k + \alpha p_k) = f(x_k) + \alpha \nabla f(x_k)^T p_k + \frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 p_k^T \nabla^2 f(x_k) p_k, \quad \alpha_k = -\frac{\nabla f(x_k)^T p_k}{p_k^T \nabla^2 f(x_k) p_k}.$$

Afterwards we update the residuals with  $r_{k+1} = r_k - \alpha_k A p_k$  and the directions with  $p_{k+1} = r_{k+1} - \sum_{j=0}^k \gamma_{k+1,j} p_j$  such that  $\text{Span}\{p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}\}$  forms a basis of  $\mathcal{K}_{k+2}(A, b)$ . We could apply a Gram-Schmidt process to orthogonalize  $p_{k+1}$  against all previous directions, but a more relevant approach is to  $H$ -conjugate them to derive a shorter recurrence, where  $H = \nabla^2 f(x)$  is constant.  $H$ -conjugacy also ensures that the vectors are linearly independent. For  $i = 0, \dots, k$ ,  $p_i^T H p_{k+1} = 0$  implies  $\gamma_{k+1,i} = p_i^T H r_{k+1} / p_i^T H p_i$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}_k := \text{Span}\{p_0, \dots, p_k\} = \text{Span}\{r_0, \dots, r_k\}$ . The exact linesearch property yields  $\nabla f(x_{k+1})^T p_k$  but also  $\nabla f(x_{k+1}) \perp \mathcal{P}_k$  — see, e.g., [14, proof of Theorem 5.2]. Because  $A p_i = (r_i - r_{i+1}) / \alpha_i \in \text{Span}\{r_i, r_{i+1}\} \subset \mathcal{P}_k$  for  $i = 0, \dots, k-1$ , we have  $p_i^T A \nabla f(x_{k+1}) = -p_i^T \nabla^2 f(x_{k+1}) r_{k+1} = -p_i^T H r_{k+1} = 0$  and  $\gamma_{k+1,i} = 0$ . With  $\beta_k = -\gamma_{k+1,k} = -p_k^T H r_{k+1} / p_k^T H p_k$ , we obtain  $p_{k+1} = r_{k+1} + \beta_k p_k$ .

**THEOREM 6.1.** For CG, CR and CAR, we have:

$$\alpha_k = \frac{\rho_k}{p_k^T H p_k} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_k = \frac{\rho_{k+1}}{\rho_k} \quad \text{with} \quad \rho_k = -\nabla f(x_k)^T r_k.$$

See proof on page 17.

CG, CR and CAR require  $A$  to be SPD because we then have  $\alpha_k > 0$  until  $r_k = 0$ . The formulations of CG (Algorithm 6.1), CR (Algorithm 6.2) and CAR (Algorithm 6.3) compare the methods and suggest efficient implementations. The vectors  $s_k = Ar_k$ ,

$q_k = Ap_k$ ,  $t_k = As_k = A^2 r_k$  and  $u_k = Aq_k = A^2 p_k$  ultimately involve just one matrix-vector product with  $A$  per iteration. Properties of CAR are summarized in [Theorem 6.3](#). By virtue of its equivalence to MINARES in exact arithmetic, CAR allows us to establish monotonicity of relevant quantities for MINARES ([Theorem 6.4](#)) on SPD systems. The proofs are strongly inspired by those in [\[5, 12\]](#) for similar properties of CR and MINRES.

Algorithm 6.1 CG	Algorithm 6.2 CR	Algorithm 6.3 CAR
<b>Require:</b> $A, b, \epsilon > 0$ $k = 0, x_0 = 0$ $r_0 = b, p_0 = r_0$ $q_0 = Ap_0$  $\rho_0 = r_0^T r_0$ <b>while</b> $\ r_k\  > \epsilon$ <b>do</b> $\alpha_k = \rho_k / p_k^T q_k$ $x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k p_k$ $r_{k+1} = r_k - \alpha_k q_k$  $\rho_{k+1} = r_{k+1}^T r_{k+1}$ $\beta_k = \rho_{k+1} / \rho_k$ $p_{k+1} = r_{k+1} + \beta_k p_k$ $q_{k+1} = Ap_{k+1}$  $k \leftarrow k + 1$ <b>end while</b>	<b>Require:</b> $A, b, \epsilon > 0$ $k = 0, x_0 = 0$ $r_0 = b, p_0 = r_0$ $s_0 = Ar_0, q_0 = s_0$  $\rho_0 = r_0^T s_0$ <b>while</b> $\ r_k\  > \epsilon$ <b>do</b> $\alpha_k = \rho_k / \ q_k\ ^2$ $x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k p_k$ $r_{k+1} = r_k - \alpha_k q_k$ $s_{k+1} = Ar_{k+1}$  $\rho_{k+1} = r_{k+1}^T s_{k+1}$ $\beta_k = \rho_{k+1} / \rho_k$ $p_{k+1} = r_{k+1} + \beta_k p_k$ $q_{k+1} = s_{k+1} + \beta_k q_k$  $k \leftarrow k + 1$ <b>end while</b>	<b>Require:</b> $A, b, \epsilon > 0$ $k = 0, x_0 = 0$ $r_0 = b, p_0 = r_0$ $s_0 = Ar_0, q_0 = s_0$ $t_0 = As_0, u_0 = t_0$ $\rho_0 = s_0^T t_0$ <b>while</b> $\ r_k\  > \epsilon$ <b>do</b> $\alpha_k = \rho_k / \ u_k\ ^2$ $x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k p_k$ $r_{k+1} = r_k - \alpha_k q_k$ $s_{k+1} = s_k - \alpha_k u_k$ $t_{k+1} = As_{k+1}$ $\rho_{k+1} = s_{k+1}^T t_{k+1}$ $\beta_k = \rho_{k+1} / \rho_k$ $p_{k+1} = r_{k+1} + \beta_k p_k$ $q_{k+1} = s_{k+1} + \beta_k q_k$ $u_{k+1} = t_{k+1} + \beta_k u_k$ $k \leftarrow k + 1$ <b>end while</b>

LEMMA 6.2. *Let  $A$  be SPD. The following properties hold for CAR and MINARES for all  $k \geq 0$ :*

- (a)  $\zeta_{k+1} d_{k+1} = \alpha_k p_k$
- (b)  $s_k = Ar_k$
- (c)  $q_k = Ap_k$
- (d)  $t_k = As_k$
- (e)  $u_k = Aq_k$ .

See proof on page 18.

THEOREM 6.3. *Let  $A$  be SPD. For  $(i, j) \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}^2$ , the following properties hold for CAR:*

- (a)  $p_i^T A^4 p_j = 0$  ( $i \neq j$ )
- (b)  $r_i^T A^3 p_j = 0$  ( $i > j$ )
- (c)  $r_i^T A^3 r_j = 0$  ( $i \neq j$ )
- (d)  $\alpha_i \geq 0$
- (e)  $\beta_i \geq 0$
- (f)  $q_i^T u_j = p_i^T A^3 p_j \geq 0$
- (g)  $q_i^T q_j = p_i^T A^2 p_j \geq 0$
- (h)  $q_i^T p_j = p_i^T A p_j \geq 0$
- (i)  $p_i^T p_j \geq 0$

- (j)  $x_i^T p_j \geq 0$
- (k)  $r_i^T q_j = r_i^T A p_j \geq 0$ .

See proof on page 18.

**THEOREM 6.4.** *For CAR (and hence MINARES) applied to  $Ax = b$  when  $A$  is SPD, the following properties are satisfied:*

- $\|x_k\|$  increases monotonically
- $\|x^* - x_k\|$  decreases monotonically
- $\|x^* - x_k\|_A$  decreases monotonically
- $\|r_k\|$  decreases monotonically.

See proof on page 19.

**7. Implementation and numerical experiments.** We implemented [Algorithm 4.1](#) and [Algorithm 6.3](#) in Julia [1], version 1.9, as part of our `Krylov.jl` collection of Krylov methods [13]. These implementations of MINARES and CAR are applicable in any floating-point system supported by Julia, including complex numbers, and they run on CPU and GPU. They also support preconditioners.

We evaluate the performance of MINARES on systems generated from symmetric matrices  $A$  in the SuiteSparse Matrix Collection [3]. In each case we first scale  $A$  to be  $A/\alpha$  with  $\alpha = \max |A_{ij}|$ , so that  $\|A\| \approx 1$ .

In our first set of experiments, we compare MINARES to our Julia implementation of MINRES-QLP in terms of number of iterations on consistent systems when the stopping criterion is  $\|r_k\| \leq 10^{-10}$ , then when it is  $\|Ar_k\| \leq 10^{-10}$ . The right-hand side  $b = Ae$  (with  $e$  a vector of ones) ensures that the system is consistent even if  $A$  is singular. The residual and A-residual are calculated explicitly at each iteration in order to evaluate  $\|r_k\|$  and  $\|Ar_k\|$ . (To get a fair comparison, (5.10) and (5.11) are not used.) [Figure 7.1](#) reports residual and A-residual histories for MINARES and MINRES-QLP on problems `rail_5177` and `bcsstm36`. We observe that MINRES-QLP's  $\|Ar_k\|$  is erratic, whereas MINARES's  $\|Ar_k\|$  and  $\|r_k\|$  are both smooth. Also, MINRES-QLP's  $\|Ar_k\|$  lags further behind MINARES's than MINARES's  $\|r_k\|$  does behind MINRES-QLP's. When the system is consistent, we have similar behavior whether  $A$  is singular or not.

In a second set of experiments, we compare MINARES to our Julia implementations of MINRES-QLP and LSMR in terms of number of matrix-vector products  $Av$  on singular inconsistent systems with  $b = e$  when the stopping criterion is  $\|Ar_k\| \leq 10^{-6}$  for the problem `zenios` and  $\|Ar_k\| \leq 10^{-10}$  for `laser`. [Figure 7.2](#) shows that MINRES-QLP has difficulty reaching the specified  $\|Ar_k\|$ , but MINARES performs well and converges much faster than LSMR, the only other Krylov method that minimizes  $\|Ar_k\|$ .

**8. Summary.** MINARES completes the family of Krylov methods based on the symmetric Lanczos process. By minimizing  $\|Ar_k\|$  (which always converges to zero), MINARES can be applied safely to any symmetric system. For SPD systems, CAR is equivalent to MINARES and extends the conjugate directions family CG and CR. For such systems we prove that  $\|r_k\|$ ,  $\|x_k - x^*\|$  and  $\|x_k - x^*\|_A$  decrease monotonically for CAR and hence MINARES.

On consistent symmetric systems, MINARES is a relevant alternative to MINRES and MINRES-QLP because it converges in a similar number of iterations if the stopping condition is based on  $\|r_k\|$ , and much faster if the stopping condition is based on  $\|Ar_k\|$ . On singular inconsistent symmetric systems, MINARES outperforms MINRES-QLP and LSMR, and should be the preferred method.




FIG. 7.1. Residual and A-residual histories for MINARES and MINRES-QLP on consistent systems generated from the SuiteSparse Matrix Collection. Top: System based on the nonsingular matrix rail\_5177 ( $n = 5177$ ). Bottom: System based on the singular matrix bcstsm36 ( $n = 23052$ ).




FIG. 7.2. A-residual history for MINARES, MINRES-QLP and LSMR on singular inconsistent systems generated from the SuiteSparse Matrix Collection. Left: System based on the singular matrix zenios ( $n = 2873$ ). Right: System based on the singular matrix laser ( $n = 3002$ ).

**Acknowledgements.** This work began while the first author was visiting ICME at Stanford University in Spring 2022. My thanks to Mike Saunders for making my stay such a pleasant one.

### Appendix A. Proofs.

**THEOREM 4.1.** For  $k \leq \ell - 2$ ,  $T_{k+2,k+1}T_{k+1,k}$  has rank  $k$ .

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* From (4.6a) and (4.8) we have

$$T_{k+2,k+1}T_{k+1,k} = \begin{bmatrix} R_k^T R_k \\ (\varepsilon_{k-1} e_{k-1}^T + \gamma_k e_k^T) R_k \\ \varepsilon_k e_k^T R_k \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $R_k^T R_k$  has rank  $k$  because  $T_{k+1,k}$  and hence  $R_k$  have full column rank.  $\square$

**THEOREM 4.2.**  $T_\ell T_{\ell,\ell-1}$  has rank  $\ell - 1$ .

*Proof of Theorem 4.2.* From (4.6b) and (4.8) we have

$$T_\ell T_{\ell,\ell-1} = \begin{bmatrix} R_{\ell-1}^T R_{\ell-1} \\ (\varepsilon_{\ell-1} e_{\ell-1}^T + \gamma_\ell e_\ell^T) R_{\ell-1} \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $R_{\ell-1}^T R_{\ell-1}$  has rank  $\ell - 1$  because  $T_{\ell,\ell-1}$  and  $R_{\ell-1}$  have full column rank.  $\square$

**THEOREM 4.3.**  $T_\ell^2 y_\ell = \beta_1 \alpha_1 e_1 + \beta_1 \beta_2 e_2$  is consistent even if  $T_\ell$  is singular.

*Proof of Theorem 4.3.* If  $T_\ell$  is singular, the symmetry of  $T_\ell$  and its complete orthogonal decomposition give

$$T_\ell = Q \begin{bmatrix} L & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} P = P^T \begin{bmatrix} L^T & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} Q^T \quad \text{and} \quad T_\ell^2 = P^T \begin{bmatrix} L^T L & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} P,$$

where  $Q$  and  $P$  are orthogonal and  $\text{rank}(L) = \ell - 1$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} T_\ell^2 y_\ell - \beta_1 \alpha_1 e_1 - \beta_1 \beta_2 e_2 &= T_\ell^2 y_\ell - \beta_1 T_\ell e_1 \\ &= P^T \left( \begin{bmatrix} L^T L & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} P y_\ell - \beta_1 \begin{bmatrix} L^T & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} Q^T e_1 \right) \\ &= P^T \begin{bmatrix} L^T L t_{\ell-1} - L^T u_{\ell-1} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $t_{\ell-1}$  and  $u_{\ell-1}$  are the first  $\ell - 1$  components of  $P y_\ell$  and  $\beta_1 Q^T e_1$ . Because  $L$  has full rank,  $L^T L t_{\ell-1} = L^T u_{\ell-1}$  has a unique solution. Then,  $y_\ell = P^T \begin{bmatrix} t_{\ell-1} \\ \omega \end{bmatrix}$  is a solution of  $T_\ell^2 y_\ell = \beta_1 \alpha_1 e_1 + \beta_1 \beta_2 e_2$  for any  $\omega$ , which means the system is consistent.  $\square$

**THEOREM 4.4.** If  $b \in \text{range}(A)$ , the final MINARES iterate  $x_\ell$  is the minimum-length solution of  $Ax = b$  (and  $r_\ell = b - Ax_\ell = 0$ ).

*Proof of Theorem 4.4.* The final MINARES subproblem is  $T_\ell^2 y_\ell = \beta_1 \alpha_1 e_1 + \beta_1 \beta_2 e_2 = T_\ell \beta_1 e_1$ . Because  $b \in \text{range}(A)$ ,  $T_\ell$  is nonsingular, and the latter system is equivalent to  $T_\ell y_\ell = \beta_1 e_1$ , the subproblem solved by MINRES and MINRES-QLP. The final iterate generated by these methods is the minimum-length solution of  $Ax = b$  [2, sec. 3.2 theorem 3.1].  $\square$

**THEOREM 4.5.** If  $Ax = b$  is inconsistent,  $\zeta_\ell = 0$  and  $Ar_{\ell-1} = 0$ .

*Proof of Theorem 4.5.* From (4.6c), (4.9) and Theorem 4.3:

$$z_\ell = \tilde{Q}_\ell^T (\beta_1 \alpha_1 e_1 + \beta_1 \beta_2 e_2) = \tilde{Q}_\ell^T T_\ell^2 y_\ell = \tilde{Q}_\ell^T N_\ell R_\ell y_\ell = U_\ell R_\ell y_\ell.$$

When  $Ax = b$  is inconsistent,  $T_\ell$  has rank  $\ell - 1$  and  $r_\ell = 0$ . Because  $R_\ell$  and  $U_\ell$  are upper triangular matrices,  $\zeta_\ell = u_{\ell\ell} r_{\ell\ell} v_\ell = 0$ , where  $v_\ell$  is the last component of  $y_\ell$ . From (4.14),  $Ar_{\ell-1} = 0$  when  $\zeta_\ell = 0$ .  $\square$



LEMMA 5.1. In (5.5),  $\pi_i = \tau_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k-2$ .

*Proof of Lemma 5.1.* Let  $L_{k-2}$  be the leading  $(k-2) \times (k-2)$  submatrix of  $\hat{L}_k$ , and  $J_{m,n}$  be the first  $m$  rows of  $I_n$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{k-2}J_{k-2,k+1}p_{k+1} &= J_{k-2,k}\hat{L}_kJ_{k,k+1}\begin{bmatrix} \hat{P}_k & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}Q_k^T\beta_1e_1 \\
&= J_{k-2,k}U_kJ_{k,k+1}Q_k^T\beta_1e_1 \\
&= J_{k-2,k+2}\tilde{Q}_k^TN_kJ_{k,k+1}Q_k^T\beta_1e_1 \\
&= J_{k-2,k+2}\tilde{Q}_k^TT_{k+2,k+1}Q_kJ_{k,k+1}^TJ_{k,k+1}Q_k^T\beta_1e_1 \\
&= J_{k-2,k+2}\tilde{Q}_k^TT_{k+2,k+1}Q_k(I_{k+1}-e_{k+1}e_{k+1}^T)Q_k^T\beta_1e_1 \\
&= J_{k-2,k+2}\tilde{Q}_k^T(\beta_1\alpha_1e_1+\beta_1\beta_2-\bar{\chi}_{k+1}T_{k+2,k+1}Q_k e_{k+1}) \\
&= J_{k-2,k+2}(\bar{z}_k-\bar{\chi}_{k+1}\tilde{Q}_k^TT_{k+2,k+1}Q_k e_{k+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

We now have  $T_{k+2,k+1}Q_k e_{k+1} = -(\alpha_{k+1}c_k + \beta_{k+1}c_{k-1}s_k)e_{k+1} - c_k\beta_{k+2}e_{k+2}$ . Further, from the structure of the reflections composing  $\tilde{Q}_k^T$ , the first  $k-2$  elements of  $\tilde{Q}_k^TT_{k+2,k+1}Q_k e_{k+1}$  are zero. Thus,

$$L_{k-2}(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{k-2}) = z_{k-2}.$$

Because  $L_{k-2}$  is always nonsingular,

$$L_{k-2}\begin{bmatrix} \pi_1 - \tau_1 \\ \vdots \\ \pi_{k-2} - \tau_{k-2} \end{bmatrix} = 0 \implies \begin{bmatrix} \pi_1 \\ \vdots \\ \pi_{k-2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \tau_1 \\ \vdots \\ \tau_{k-2} \end{bmatrix}. \quad \square$$

THEOREM 6.1. For CG, CR and CAR, we have:

$$\alpha_k = \frac{\rho_k}{p_k^T H p_k} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_k = \frac{\rho_{k+1}}{\rho_k} \quad \text{with} \quad \rho_k = -\nabla f(x_k)^T r_k.$$

*Proof of Theorem 6.1.* Let  $\rho_k = -\nabla f(x_k)^T r_k$ . Because  $p_k = r_k + \beta_{k-1}p_{k-1}$  and  $\nabla f(x_k) \perp p_{k-1}$  (exact linesearch property),  $\nabla f(x_k)^T p_k = \nabla f(x_k)^T r_k$ . Therefore,

$$\alpha_k = -\frac{\nabla f(x_k)^T p_k}{p_k^T H p_k} = -\frac{\nabla f(x_k)^T r_k}{p_k^T H p_k} = \frac{\rho_k}{p_k^T H p_k}.$$

Because the directions  $p_i$  are H-conjugate,  $p_k^T H p_k = p_k^T H (r_k + \beta_{k-1}p_{k-1}) = p_k^T H r_k$ . With the relations  $Hr_i = -A\nabla f(x_i)$  and  $Ap_k = (r_k - r_{k+1})/\alpha_k$ , we have:

$$\beta_k = -\frac{p_k^T H r_{k+1}}{p_k^T H p_k} = -\frac{p_k^T H r_{k+1}}{p_k^T H r_k} = -\frac{\nabla f(x_{k+1})^T (r_k - r_{k+1})}{\nabla f(x_k)^T (r_k - r_{k+1})} = \frac{\nabla f(x_{k+1})^T r_{k+1}}{\nabla f(x_k)^T r_k} = \frac{\rho_{k+1}}{\rho_k},$$

where we used the fact that  $\nabla f(x_{k+1})^T r_k = -r_{k+1}^T A^i r_k = \nabla f(x_k)^T r_{k+1} = 0$ , ( $i = 0$  for CG,  $i = 1$  for CR and  $i = 3$  for CAR).  $\square$

LEMMA 6.2. Let  $A$  be SPD. The following properties hold for CAR and MINARES for all  $k \geq 0$ :

- (a)  $\zeta_{k+1}d_{k+1} = \alpha_k p_k$
- (b)  $s_k = Ar_k$

- (c)  $q_k = Ap_k$
- (d)  $t_k = As_k$
- (e)  $u_k = Aq_k$ .

*Proof of Lemma 6.2.* (a) follows by direct comparison of Algorithm 4.1 and Algorithm 6.3.

(b)–(e) all hold by construction at  $k = 0$ . By induction, assume that they also hold at index  $k \geq 0$ . Then,  $s_{k+1} = s_k - \alpha_k u_k = Ar_k - \alpha_k Aq_k = Ar_{k+1}$ , which establishes (b). The remaining properties follow similarly.  $\square$

**THEOREM 6.3.** *Let  $A$  be SPD. For  $(i, j) \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}^2$ , the following properties hold for cAR:*

- (a)  $p_i^T A^4 p_j = 0$  ( $i \neq j$ )
- (b)  $r_i^T A^3 p_j = 0$  ( $i > j$ )
- (c)  $r_i^T A^3 r_j = 0$  ( $i \neq j$ )
- (d)  $\alpha_i \geq 0$
- (e)  $\beta_i \geq 0$
- (f)  $q_i^T u_j = p_i^T A^3 p_j \geq 0$
- (g)  $q_i^T q_j = p_i^T A^2 p_j \geq 0$
- (h)  $q_i^T p_j = p_i^T A p_j \geq 0$
- (i)  $p_i^T p_j \geq 0$
- (j)  $x_i^T p_j \geq 0$
- (k)  $r_i^T q_j = r_i^T A p_j \geq 0$ .

*Proof of Theorem 6.3.* Because  $\nabla^2 f_{\text{cAR}}(x) = A^4$ , we  $A^4$ -conjugate the vectors  $p_i$  by construction and (a) is satisfied.

Because  $\nabla f_{\text{cAR}}(x_i) = -A^3 r_i$ , the exact linesearch property yields (b) as in [14, proof of Theorem 5.2].

If  $i > j$ ,  $r_i^T A^3 r_j = r_i^T A^3 (p_j - \beta_{j-1} p_{j-1}) = 0$  by (b). If  $i < j$ ,  $r_i^T A^3 r_j = (p_i - \beta_{i-1} p_{i-1})^T A^3 r_j = 0$ , again thanks to (b), which proves (c).

First note that  $\rho_i = s_i^T t_i = r_i^T A^3 r_i \geq 0$  because  $A$  is SPD. Thus  $\alpha_i = \rho_i / \|u_i\|^2 \geq 0$  and  $\beta_i = \rho_{i+1} / \rho_i \geq 0$ , which proves (d) and (e).

We now establish (f) by induction. If  $i = j$ ,  $q_i^T u_i = q_i^T A q_i \geq 0$  because  $A$  is SPD. Assuming  $q_i^T u_j \geq 0$  when  $|i - j| = k - 1 \geq 0$ , we want to show the result for  $|i - j| = k$ . If  $i - j = k > 0$  then  $q_i^T u_j = q_i^T u_{i-k}$ . Otherwise we have  $j - i = k > 0$  and  $q_i^T u_j = q_i^T u_{i+k}$ . Lemma 6.2 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
q_i^T u_{i-k} &= (s_i + \beta_{i-1} q_{i-1})^T u_{i-k} & q_i^T u_{i+k} &= q_i^T A q_{i+k} \\
&= s_i^T u_{i-k} + \beta_{i-1} q_{i-1}^T u_{i-k} & &= q_i^T A (s_{i+k} + \beta_{i+k-1} q_{i+k-1}) \\
&= r_i^T A^3 p_{i-k} + \beta_{i-1} q_{i-1}^T u_{i-k} & &= p_i^T A^3 r_{i+k} + \beta_{i+k-1} u_i^T q_{i+k-1} \\
&= \beta_{i-1} q_{i-1}^T u_{i-k} & &= \beta_{i+k-1} q_{i+k-1}^T u_i
\end{aligned}$$

$\beta_{i-1} \geq 0$  and  $\beta_{i+k-1} \geq 0$  by (e).  $q_{i-1}^T u_{i-k} \geq 0$  and  $q_{i+k-1}^T u_i \geq 0$  by induction assumption. Thus,  $q_i^T u_j \geq 0$  for  $|i - j| = k$ , which completes the proof of (f).

At termination, define  $\mathcal{P} = \text{Span}\{p_0, \dots, p_{\ell-1}\}$ ,  $\mathcal{Q} = \text{Span}\{q_0, \dots, q_{\ell-1}\} = A\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{U} = \text{Span}\{u_0, \dots, u_{\ell-1}\} = A\mathcal{Q}$ . By construction,  $\mathcal{P} = \text{Span}\{b, \dots, A^{\ell-1}b\}$ ,  $\mathcal{Q} = \text{Span}\{Ab, \dots, A^\ell b\}$  and  $\mathcal{U} = \text{Span}\{A^2 b, \dots, A^{\ell+1}b\}$ . Again by construction,

$x_\ell \in \mathcal{P}$ , and since  $r_\ell = 0$ , we have  $Ax_\ell = b \in \mathcal{Q}$  and  $A^2x_\ell = Ab \in \mathcal{U}$ . We see that  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{U}$ .

(a) and Lemma 6.2 (c)–(e) imply that  $u_i^T u_j = 0$  for  $i \neq j$ , and therefore,  $\{u_k / \|u_k\|\}_{k=0, \dots, \ell-1}$  forms an orthonormal basis for  $\mathcal{U}$ . Thus, if we project  $p_i$  and  $q_i$  into  $\mathcal{U}$ , we have

$$p_i = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell-1} \frac{p_i^T u_k}{u_k^T u_k} u_k \quad \text{and} \quad q_i = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell-1} \frac{q_i^T u_k}{u_k^T u_k} u_k.$$

Scalar products between these vectors can be expressed as

$$q_i^T q_j = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell-1} \frac{(q_i^T u_k)(q_j^T u_k)}{\|u_k\|^2}, \quad p_i^T q_j = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell-1} \frac{(p_i^T u_k)(q_j^T u_k)}{\|u_k\|^2} \quad \text{and} \quad p_i^T p_j = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell-1} \frac{(p_i^T u_k)(p_j^T u_k)}{\|u_k\|^2}.$$

Thus  $q_i^T q_j \geq 0$  by (f), proving (g). Because  $p_i^T u_k = p_i^T A q_k = q_i^T q_k$ ,  $p_i^T q_j \geq 0$  and  $p_i^T p_j \geq 0$  by (f) and (g), which proves (h) and (i).

By construction,  $x_i = \sum_{k=0}^i \alpha_k p_k$  and so  $x_i^T p_j \geq 0$  by (d) and (i), proving (j).

Finally,  $r_i^T q_j = \sum_{k=i}^{\ell-1} \alpha_k q_k^T q_j \geq 0$  by (d) and (g), proving (k).  $\square$

**THEOREM 6.4.** *For CAR (and hence MINARES) applied to  $Ax = b$  when  $A$  is SPD, the following properties are satisfied:*

- $\|x_k\|$  increases monotonically
- $\|x^* - x_k\|$  decreases monotonically
- $\|x^* - x_k\|_A$  decreases monotonically
- $\|r_k\|$  decreases monotonically.

*Proof of Theorem 6.4.* From Theorem 6.3 (d) and (j),

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_k\|^2 - \|x_{k-1}\|^2 &= (x_{k-1} + \alpha_k p_k)^T (x_{k-1} + \alpha_k p_k) - x_{k-1}^T x_{k-1} \\ &= 2\alpha_k p_k^T x_{k-1} + \alpha_k^2 \|p_k\|^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

From Theorem 6.3 (d) and (i),

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^* - x_{k-1}\|^2 - \|x^* - x_k\|^2 &= \left( \sum_{i=k}^{\ell-1} \alpha_i p_i \right)^T \left( \sum_{i=k}^{\ell-1} \alpha_i p_i \right) - \left( \sum_{i=k+1}^{\ell-1} \alpha_i p_i \right)^T \left( \sum_{i=k+1}^{\ell-1} \alpha_i p_i \right) \\ &= 2\alpha_k p_k^T \left( \sum_{i=k+1}^{\ell-1} \alpha_i p_i \right) + \alpha_k^2 \|p_k\|^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

From Theorem 6.3 (d) and (h),

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^* - x_{k-1}\|_A^2 - \|x^* - x_k\|_A^2 &= \left( \sum_{i=k}^{\ell-1} \alpha_i p_i \right)^T A \left( \sum_{i=k}^{\ell-1} \alpha_i p_i \right) - \left( \sum_{i=k+1}^{\ell-1} \alpha_i p_i \right)^T A \left( \sum_{i=k+1}^{\ell-1} \alpha_i p_i \right) \\ &= 2\alpha_k q_k^T \left( \sum_{i=k+1}^{\ell-1} \alpha_i p_i \right) + \alpha_k^2 q_k^T p_k \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

From Theorem 6.3 (d) and (k),

$$\begin{aligned} \|r_{k-1}\|^2 - \|r_k\|^2 &= r_{k-1}^T r_{k-1} - r_k^T r_k \\ &= (r_k + \alpha_{k-1} q_{k-1})^T (r_k + \alpha_{k-1} q_{k-1}) - r_k^T r_k \\ &= 2\alpha_{k-1} q_{k-1}^T r_k + \alpha_{k-1}^2 \|q_{k-1}\|^2 \geq 0. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bezanson, A. Edelman, S. Karpinski, and V. B. Shah. *Julia: A fresh approach to numerical computing*. *SIAM Rev.*, 59(1):65–98, 2017.
- [2] S.-C. Choi, C. C. Paige, and M. A. Saunders. *MINRES-QLP: A Krylov subspace method for indefinite or singular symmetric systems*. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 33(4):1810–1836, 2011.
- [3] T. Davis and Y. Hu. *The University of Florida sparse matrix collection*. *ACM Trans. Math. Software*, 38(1):1–25, 2011. See <https://sparse.tamu.edu/>.
- [4] D. C.-L. Fong and M. A. Saunders. *LSMR: An iterative algorithm for sparse least-squares problems*. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 33(5):2950–2971, 2011.
- [5] D. C.-L. Fong and M. A. Saunders. *CG versus MINRES: an empirical comparison*. *Sultan Qaboos University Journal for Science*, 17(1):44–62, 2012.
- [6] K. A. Gallivan, S. Thirumalai, P. V. Dooren, and V. Vermaut. *High performance algorithms for Toeplitz and block Toeplitz matrices*. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 241:343–388, 1996.
- [7] G. H. Golub and W. Kahan. *Calculating the singular values and pseudo-inverse of a matrix*. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 2(2):205–224, 1965.
- [8] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan. *Matrix Computations*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, fourth edition, 2013.
- [9] M. R. Hestenes and E. Stiefel. *Methods of conjugate gradients for solving linear systems*. *J. Res. Natl. Bur. Stand.*, 49(6):409–436, 1952.
- [10] E. F. Kaasschieter. *Preconditioned conjugate gradients for solving singular systems*. *J. Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 24(1-2):265–275, 1988.
- [11] C. Lanczos. *An iteration method for the solution of the eigenvalue problem of linear differential and integral operators*. *J. Res. Natl. Bur. Stand.*, 45:225–280, 1950.
- [12] D. G. Luenberger. *The conjugate residual method for constrained minimization problems*. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 7(3):390–398, 1970.
- [13] A. Montoison and D. Orban. *Krylov.jl: A Julia basket of hand-picked Krylov methods*. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 8(89):5187, 2023.
- [14] J. Nocedal and S. J. Wright. *Numerical Optimization*. Springer New York, NY, 2 edition, 2006.
- [15] C. C. Paige and M. A. Saunders. *Solution of sparse indefinite systems of linear equations*. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 12(4):617–629, 1975.
- [16] C. C. Paige and M. A. Saunders. *LSQR: An algorithm for sparse linear equations and sparse least squares*. *ACM Trans. Math. Software*, 8(1):43–71, 1982.
- [17] E. Stiefel. *Relaxationsmethoden bester strategie zur lösung linearer gleichungssysteme*. *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici*, 29(1):157–179, 1955.
- [18] L. N. Trefethen and D. Bau III. *Numerical Linear Algebra*. SIAM, Philadelphia, 1997.