1990

On the Optimum Relaxation Factor Associated with p-Cyclic Matrices

S. Galanis

A. Hadjidimos

D. Noutsos

Report Number:

90-958

ON THE OPTIMUM RELAXATION FACTOR ASSOCIATED WITH p-CYCLIC MATRICES

S. Galanis*, A. Hadjidimos*,**
D. Noutsos* and M. Tzoumas*

Computer Sciences Department
Purdue University
Technical Report CSD-TR-958
CAPO Report CER-90-11
February, 1990

---

* Department of Mathematics, University of Ioannina, GR-451 10 Ioannina, Greece.

** Visiting, Department of Computer Sciences, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907. The work of this author was supported in part by AFOSR grant 88/0243 and by NSF grant CCR-8619817.

On the Optimum Relaxation Factor Associated with p-Cyclic Matrices

S. Galanis*, A. Hadjidimos*,**
D. Noutsos* and M. Tzoumas*

Computer Sciences Department
Purdue University
Technical Report CSD-TR-858
CAPO Report CER-90-11
February, 1990

ABSTRACT

Assume that the matrix coefficient in the nonsingular linear system $Ax = b$ belongs to the class of the Generalized Consistently Ordered $(p-q,\ q)$-matrices, where p and q are relatively prime. It is well-known that under the additional assumption that the p^{th} powers of the eigenvalues of the Jacobi matrix T associated with A are non-negative (non-positive) the problem of the determination of the optimum relaxation factor that maximizes the asymptotic convergence rate of the Successive Overrelaxation method for the solution of $Ax = b$ has been solved in many cases. Thus, in the non-negative case, and after the works by Young, by Varga, and by Nichols and Fox, the problem has been solved for any $(p,\ q)$. In the non-positive case, and after the works by Kredell, by Niethammer, de Pillis and Varga, by Galanis, Hadjidimos and Noutsos, and by Wild and Niethammer, the corresponding problem seems to be more difficult and has been solved only for $(p,\ q) = (p,\ p-1)$. The present work is a contribution towards the solution of the problem in question in the latter case for $(p,\ q) = (p,\ 1)$, $p \geq 3$. It is shown that the optimum relaxation factor always lies in $(0,1]$, among others, and this factor is determined in the particular cases $p = 3$ and 4.

---

* Department of Mathematics, University of Ioannina, GR-451 10 Ioannina, Greece.

** Visiting, Department of Computer Sciences, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907. The work of this author was supported in part by AFOSR grant 88/0243 and by NSF grant CCR-8619817.

1. Introduction and Preliminaries

Given the nonsingular linear system

$$Ax = b, \tag{1.1}$$

where A is partitioned into blocks $A_{i,j}$, $i,j = 1(1)n$, and where A_{ii}, $i = 1(1)n$, are square and nonsingular. Write A as

$$A = D - L - U, \tag{1.2}$$

where $D = \operatorname{diag}(A_{11}, ..., A_{nn})$ and L and U are strictly lower and strictly upper triangular matrices respectively. Assume further that relative to the block partitioning considered A is a Generalized Consistently Ordered $(p-q,\ q)$-matrix (or $(p-q,\ q)$-GCO matrix) with p and q relatively prime integers (see [9] or [4]). If $\sigma(M)$ denotes the spectrum of the eigenvalues of the matrix M then the $(p-q,\ q)$-GCO property is equivalent to having $\sigma(D^{-1}(\alpha^{p-q} L + \alpha^{-q} U))$ independent of α, for all $\alpha \neq 0$. This GCO property generalizes previous ones introduced and studied by Young ([11], [12]), Varga ([7], [8]) and others (see [4]). In such a case the eigenvalues of the Successive Overrelaxation (SOR) matrix $\mathcal{L}_\omega$ and of the Jacobi matrix T associated with A,

$$\mathcal{L}_\omega := (D - \omega L)^{-1} [(1-\omega) D + \omega U] \tag{1.3}$$

and

$$T := D^{-1} (L + U) \tag{1.4}$$

respectively, are connected through the relationship

$$(\lambda + \omega - 1)^p = \mu^p \omega^p \lambda^q, \tag{1.5}$$

where $\lambda \in \sigma(\mathcal{L}_\omega)$, $\mu\,\theta^j \in \sigma(T)$, $j = 0(1)\,p-1$, and $\theta = \exp(2\pi i/p)$ (see [9] or [4]). Relationship (1.5) is due to Verner and Bernal [9] and generalizes the famous equations of Young [11], $(p, q) = (2, 1)$, and of Varga [7], $(p, q) = (p, p-1), p \geq 3$.

The determination of the optimum relaxation factor $\omega(\omega_{opt})$ so that the asymptotic convergence rate of the SOR method for the solution of (1.1) is maximized (or equivalently $\rho(\mathcal{L}_\omega)$ is minimized, where $\rho(M)$ denotes the spectral radius of the matrix M) has attracted the interest of many researchers. So, in several cases of practical and theoretical interest ω_{opt} has been determined. Especially, for $\sigma(T^p)$ non-negative ω_{opt} was determined by Young [11], $(p, q) = (2, 1)$, by Varga [7], $(p, q) = (p, p-1)$, $p \geq 3$, and by Nichols and Fox [4], (p, q), $p \geq 3$, $q \leq p-2$. For $\sigma(T^p)$ non-positive the very first ω_{opt} was determined by Kredell [3], $(p, q) = (2, 1)$. Rather recently Niethammer, de Pillis and Varga [5], motivated from a least-squares problem ([1] and [6]), determined ω_{opt} for $(p, q) = (3, 2)$ and very recently Galanis, Hadjidimos and Noutsos [2] and independently Wild and Niethammer [10] determined it for $(p, q) = (p, p-1)$, $p \geq 4$. To the best of our knowledge nothing has been done in the case of $\sigma(T^p)$ non-positive for $p \geq 3$, $q \leq p-2$ similar to what Nichols and Fox [4] did in the non-negative case.

To start a discussion and contribute towards the solution of the problem arising in the latter case we have begun a study of the case $(p, q) = (p, 1)$, $p \geq 3$, which constitutes, somehow, the complement of the $(p, q) = (p, p-1)$ one. As the reader will find out matters do not appear to be as straightforward as one would expect them to be having in mind the analogous study in the general case of $\sigma(T^p)$ non-negative [4]. For example: In Section 2 it is shown that if there exist values of ω for which the SOR method converges then $\omega_{opt} \in (0, 1]$. This is something which would be expected. However, if $\omega_{opt} \neq 1$ (contrary to what is known for the corresponding non-negative case, where $\omega_{opt} = 1$ [4]), and this is indeed the case at least for $p = 3$ and also for a major subcase of $p = 4$ as is shown in Section 3, then $\lambda(\omega_{opt})$ in (1.5) does not correspond to a double real zero as it happens in the cases of non-negative and non-positive $\sigma(T^p)$ for $(p, q) = (p, p-1)$. It corresponds to a pair of complex conjugate zeros. We would also like to point out that some of the results of Section 2 hold for more general than the $(p, 1)$ case treated there but it is not known as yet if they can cover the entire class of pairs (p, q), $p \geq 3$, $q \leq p-2$. Finally, a basic theorem, which is proved in Section 3, is as follows:

Theorem 1: Let A be partitioned in blocks A_{ij}, $i,j = 1(1)n$, where A_{ii}, $i = 1(1)n$, are square and nonsingular. Let $D = \mathrm{diag}(A_{11}, \ldots, A_{nn})$ and A be written as in (1.2). Assume that, relative to its partitioning, A is I) (2, 1)–GCO and II) (3, 1)–GCO and let

$\mathcal{L}_\omega$ in (1.3) and T in (1.4) denote the block SOR and block Jacobi matrices associated with A respectively and let $\beta := \rho(T)$. Then: I) If $\sigma(T^3)$ is non-positive then: i) For $\beta < 2$ there exists a value for $\omega(\omega_{opt})$, the unique positive real root of the equation

$$(1+\omega)^2\,\beta^3 - 8(1-\omega) = 0 \quad (\omega_{opt} = (-(4+\beta^3) + 4(1+\beta^3)^{1/2}) / \beta^3) \qquad (1.6)$$

in $(0,1)$, such that for all $\omega \neq \omega_{opt}$

$$\rho(\mathcal{L}_\omega) > \min_{\omega} \rho(\mathcal{L}_\omega) = (1-\omega_{opt}^2)^{1/2}\,, \qquad (1.7)$$

while ii) For $\beta \geq 2$ there holds

$$\rho(\mathcal{L}_\omega) \geq 1\,. \qquad (1.8)$$

II) If $\sigma(T^4)$ is non-positive then: i) For $0 < \beta \leq 1/\sqrt[4]{8}$

$$\omega_{opt} = 1 \qquad (1.9)$$

and for all $\omega \neq \omega_{opt}$

$$\rho(\mathcal{L}_\omega) \geq \min_{\omega} \rho(\mathcal{L}_\omega) = \beta^{4/3}. \qquad (1.10)$$

ii) For $1/\sqrt[4]{8} < \beta < \sqrt{2}$ there exists a value for $\omega(\omega_{opt})$, the unique positive real root of the equation

$$\omega^2\, r^3\, \beta^2 - (r^2 - (1-\omega))^2\,(r^2 + (1-\omega)) = 0, \qquad (1.11)$$

with

$$r = ((\omega + (16 - 8\omega - 7\omega^2)^{1/2}) / 4)^{1/2}, \qquad (1.12)$$

in (0,1), such that for all $\omega \neq \omega_{opt}$

$$\rho(\mathcal{L}_\omega) > \min_\omega \rho(\mathcal{L}_\omega) = (\omega_{opt} + (16 - 8\omega_{opt} - 7\omega_{opt}^2)^{1/2}) / 4, \tag{1.13}$$

while iii) For $\beta \geq \sqrt{2}$ there holds

$$\rho(\mathcal{L}_\omega) \geq 1. \quad \square$$

Note: The trivial case $\rho(T) = 0$ is not considered in Theorem 1 and also in the general case $(p,\ q) = (p,\ 1)$ for in such a case it can readily be found out from (1.5) that $\omega_{opt} = 1$ and $\rho(\mathcal{L}_{\omega_{opt}}) = 0$. $\square$

2. Analysis of the General Case (p, q) = (p, 1)

We begin our analysis with equation (1.5). Since $\mu^p \leq 0$, μ is any eigenvalue of the Jacobi matrix T in (1.4), we set $\mu^p = -\nu^p$, with $\nu \in (0,\ \beta := \rho(T)]$ fixed and extract p^{th} roots ($q = 1$) to obtain $\lambda + \omega - 1 = \nu\,\omega\,\lambda^{1/p} \exp\,(i\,(2k+1)\,\pi\,/\,p)$, where $\lambda^{1/p}$ is any p^{th} root of λ and k is any integer. Putting $z := \lambda^{1/p} \exp\,(i(2k+1)\,\pi\,/\,p)$ we have the equivalent equation

$$g(z,\ \omega) := z^p + \omega\,\nu\ z + 1 - \omega = 0\ . \tag{2.1}$$

Let $z_j := z_j(\omega)$, $j = 1(1)p$, denote the zeros of (2.1). Since our objective is to minimize $\rho(\mathcal{L}_\omega)$ as a function of ω and $\lambda = -\ z^p$ we try, equivalently, to minimize $\max_j |z_j|$, for a fixed $\nu \in (0,\beta]$, as a function of $\omega \in (0,2)$, for if $\omega \notin (0,2)$ $\rho(\mathcal{L}_\omega) \geq 1$. Then we consider the largest possible value of the minimum in question over all $\nu \in (0,\ \beta]$. (Note: The trivial case $\nu = 0$ is not examined here or in Section 3 since it can be considered as a limiting case and can be covered by the analysis that follows by using continuity arguments.) First we prove that for a given ν the aforementioned minimum can not take place for some $\omega \in (1,2)$. For this we have:

Proposition 1: For any $\omega \in (1,2)$ equation (2.1) has always at least one zero with modulus strictly greater than $\max_j\ |z_j(1)| = \nu^{1/(p-1)}$.

Proof: By Descartes's rule of signs it is readily checked that for p odd (2.1) has precisely one real zero, which is positive, while for p even it has precisely two real zeros, one negative and one positive. If we put $y = z^p$ then from (2.1) we take

$$y + \omega \nu z + 1 - \omega = 0 \tag{2.2}$$

From (2.2) we see that if $Re\, z \le 0$ then $Rey > 0$ while if $Imz >, =, < 0$ then $Imy <, =, > 0$ respectively. We follow Nichols and Fox [4] and differentiate (2.2) and $y = z^p$ with respect to ω. After eliminating ν by using (2.1) we obtain

$$\frac{\partial y}{\partial \omega} = \frac{py(1+y)}{\omega[(p-1)y + \omega - 1]} \tag{2.3}$$

and from this

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Re}\, \frac{\partial y}{\partial \omega} &= \frac{p\,\{R\,(R+1)\,[(p-1)R + \omega - 1] + [(p-1)(R+1) - (\omega - 1)]I^2\}}{D} \\ \mathrm{Im}\, \frac{\partial y}{\partial \omega} &= \frac{p\,[(p-1)R^2 + (2R+1)(\omega - 1) + (p-1)I^2]I}{D} \;, \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

where we have set

$$R := Rey, \quad I := Imy, \quad D := \omega\{[(p-1)R + (\omega - 1)]^2 + (p-1)^2 I^2\}\,. \tag{2.5}$$

From (2.4) – (2.5) it is readily concluded that

$$\begin{gathered} R \ge 0 \quad \text{implies} \quad \mathrm{Re}\, \frac{\partial y}{\partial \omega} > 0\,, \\ R \ge 0 \quad \text{and} \quad I >, =, < 0 \quad \text{implies} \quad \mathrm{Im}\, \frac{\partial y}{\partial \omega} >, =, < 0 \quad \text{respectively}\,. \end{gathered} \tag{2.6}$$

Obviously at $\omega = 1$ and for $p \ge 4$ (the proof for $p = 3$ will be given in Section 3) (2.1) has at least one zero z with $Rez < 0$, $Imz \ge 0$ and for which $|z(1)| = \nu^{1/(p-1)}$. This particular zero we are considering will have for all $\omega \in (1,2)$ either $Rez < 0$ and $Imz = 0$ or $Rez < 0$ and $Imz > 0$. It is clear that in the first case we are referring to the real negative zero of (2.1) for even $p(\geq 4)$, while in the second case to one of the zeros in the second quadrant for odd $p(\geq 5)$. It is also evident that in the latter case $Re z$ can not become 0 for some $\omega \in (1,2)$ because then z^p will also be purely imaginary leading to a contradiction for from (2.1) $\omega = 1$. Moreover, $Im z$ can not become 0 for some $\omega \in (1,2)$ for then the zero in question and its complex conjugate one will become a **double** real negative zero for (2.1) which is not possible. Based on the previous analysis and on the conclusions (2.6) we have that the image of the corresponding y in the complex plane will have a strictly increasing real part ($R > 0$) and a nondecreasing imaginary part ($I \geq 0$) as ω will increase from 1 to 2. This implies that the modulus of y increases with respect to ω and so does the modulus of z which concludes the proof of the present Proposition. □

As a corollary to Proposition 1 we have that:

Proposition 2: The minimum of $\rho(\mathcal{L}_\omega)$ will take place for some $\omega \in (0,1]$. □

In analogy with what is known the result just obtained would be expected. This is because for $\sigma(T^p)$ **non-positive**, with $(p, q) = (p, p-1)$, it is $\omega_{opt} \in (\frac{p-2}{p-1}, 1)$ (see [3], [6], [2] and [10]). Also for non-negative $\sigma(T^p)$, with $(p, q) = (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{1})$, a special case of that treated in [4], it is $\omega_{opt} = 1$. However, what is stated and proved in the sequel, which applies at least in the cases $p = 3$ and 4 we are examining in the next section, is contrary to what is known from similar cases so far.

Proposition 3: Let $\omega_{opt} \neq 1$. Then $\max_j |z_j(\omega_{opt})|$, where z_j are the zeros of (2.1), (or equivalently $\max|\lambda(\omega_{opt})|$ of (1.5) with $q = 1$) corresponds to a pair of complex conjugate zeros of (2.1) (or equivalently of (1.5)) and **not** to a double real zero.

Proof: Applying Descartes's rule of signs for $\omega \in (0,1)$ it can be found out that for p odd $g(z,\omega)$ has precisely one real (negative) zero, while for p even it has either two real (negative) or no real zeros. For p odd let z_p be the real (negative) zero of (2.1) and (z_1,z_2), (z_3,z_4), ..., (z_{p-2},z_{p-1}) the pairs of complex conjugate zeros. At $\omega = 1$ it is $|z_j| > |z_p| = 0$, $j = 1(1)p-1$. So, if our assertion were not true there would be an $\omega \in (0,1)$ at which $|z_p| \geq |z_j|$, $j = 1(1)p-1$. Recalling that $\prod_{j=1}^{p} z_j = \omega - 1$, the previous inequality would give $-z_p^p \geq 1-\omega$ or $z^p + 1 - \omega \leq 0$. However, (2.1) implies that $\omega \nu z_p$ or, equivalently, $z_p \geq 0$ which contradicts the fact that z_p is negative for $\omega \in (0,1)$. For p even we observe that $g(z,0) = z^p + 1$ has all its zeros complex while $g(z,1) = z^p + \nu z$ has 0 and $-\nu^{1/(p-1)}$ as its two real zeros. Using again the substitution $y = z^p$ as in Proposition 1 for the two real roots we can find out from (2.3) that as ω decreases from the value 1 the largest $y > 0$ strictly decreases while the smallest $y > 0$

strictly increases until they become equal for $\omega = \omega_c \in (0,1)$. The value ω_c is the unique positive real zero in $(0,1)$ of the equation

$$f(\omega) := (\omega v)^p - p^p (p-1)^{1-p} (1-\omega)^{p-1} \tag{2.7}$$

and the double value of y (or of z) is given by $\frac{1-\omega_c}{p-1}$ (or by $-\left[\frac{1-\omega_c}{p-1}\right]^{1/p}$). That at $\omega = \omega_c$ the double value of the zero $z = -\left[\frac{1-\omega_c}{p-1}\right]^{1/p}$ can not lead to an optimum ω is proved as follows. It is $\prod_{j=1}^{p} (z_j) = 1 - \omega_c$ at $\omega = \omega_c$, therefore $(\max \mid z_j(\omega_c) \mid)^p \geq (1-\omega_c)$. Substituting in the left hand side the value for the double z found before we have $\frac{1-\omega_c}{p-1} \geq 1 - \omega_c$. This leads to the contradiction $2 \geq p$ which concludes the proof. □

Note: Before we close this section we would like to clarify a point in connection with the value of ω_{opt} in the proof of Proposition 3 in case p is even. For this, let $\omega_d \in (0, 1)$ be the value of ω at which $\max \mid z_j(\omega) \mid$, taken over all complex z_j's, is minimized and let m_d be this minimum value. It is clear that if $\omega_d \in (0, \omega_c]$, with ω_c being defined in the proof of Proposition 3, then $\omega_{opt} = \omega_d$. However, if $\omega_d \in (\omega_c, 1)$ we distinguish two cases. So, if $\mid z_{p-1}(\omega_d) \mid \leq m_d$, where $z_{p-1}(\omega)$ is the largest in modulus of the two real negative zeros z_{p-1} and z_p of (2.1) for $\omega \in (\omega_c, 1)$, then $\omega_{opt} = \omega_d$. If, on the other hand, $\mid z_{p-1}(\omega_d) \mid > m_d$, let $\omega_e \in (\omega_c, \omega_d)$ denote the smallest value of ω at which $\mid z_{p-1}(\omega_e) \mid = \max_{j=1(1)p-2} \mid z_j(\omega_e) \mid$. As is obvious then, $\omega_{opt} = \omega_e$. □

3. The Proof of Theorem 1.

I) $p = 3$: Let z_1, z_2 and z_3 be the three zeros of (2.1) and let that the first two are the complex conjugate ones. It will be

$$\begin{aligned} &i)\ z_1 + z_2 + z_3 = 0 \\ &ii)\ (z_1 + z_2)z_3 + z_1 z_2 = \omega v \\ &iii)\ z_1 z_2 z_3 = \omega - 1\ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Eliminating $z_1 + z_2$ and z_3 from (3.1) one obtains

$$r^3 - \omega\nu\, r^2 - (1-\omega)^2 = 0, \tag{3.2}$$

where we have set $r = z_1 z_2 = |z_1(\omega)|^2$. Differentiating (3.2) with respect to ω we take

$$\frac{\partial r}{\partial \omega} = \frac{r(r^3 - (1-\omega^2))}{\omega(r^3 + 2(1-\omega)^2)}, \tag{3.3}$$

where ν was eliminated by using (3.2). Obviously for $\omega \in [1,2)$ there is no value of $r > 0$ for which the derivative in (3.3) vanishes. In fact it is always $\frac{\partial r}{\partial \omega} > 0$, showing that $|z_1(\omega)|$ strictly increases with ω in $[1,2)$. This observation completes the proof of Proposition 1. On the other hand for any $\omega \in (0,1)$ r of (3.2) assumes the minimum value $(1-\omega^2)^{1/3} > (1-\omega)^{2/3} > |\, z_3(\omega)\,|^2$. Substituting this value for r in (3.2) we obtain

$$h(\omega) := (1+\omega)^2\nu^3 - 8(1-\omega) = 0. \tag{3.4}$$

Requiring a solution ω of (3.4) to be in $(0,1)$ we must have $h(0)\,h(1) < 0$ from which the sufficient condition $\nu < 2$ is produced. Since in addition $\frac{\partial h}{\partial \omega} > 0$ the value of $\omega(=\omega_{opt})$ obtained in this way is unique and is given by

$$\omega_{opt} = (-(4+\nu^3) + 4(1+\nu^3)^{1/2}) / \nu^3. \tag{3.5}$$

The condition $\nu < 2$ is also a necessary one for the SOR method to converge for if $\nu \geq 2$ the minimum value of r would be attained at $\omega = 0$ for which $\rho(\mathcal{L}_0) = 1$. One must bear in mind that the analysis in this section was made for any $\nu \in (0,\beta]$ fixed. So, in order to determine the overall optimum one should determine the largest possible value for the minimum $r = (1-\omega_{opt}^2)^{1/3}$ just obtained. Apparently ω_{opt} must be as small as possible. Differentiating then (3.4) with respect to ν, considering ω as a function of ν, we get

$$\frac{\partial \omega}{\partial \nu} = - \frac{3\nu^2(1+\omega)^2}{2(\nu^3(1+\omega)+4)} < 0.$$

This effectively shows that ω decreases with ν increasing in $(0,\beta]$. Consequently, the optimum results are obtained for $\nu = \beta$. This concludes the analysis for the particular case $p = 3$.

II) $p = 4$: Let $z_j := z_j(\omega)$ be the four zeros of (2.1). Since at least two of them will be complex let them be z_1 and z_2. This time we will have

$$\begin{aligned} &i)\ z_1 + z_2 + z_3 + z_4 = 0 \\ &ii)\ z_1 z_2 + (z_1 + z_2)(z_3 + z_4) + z_3 z_4 = 0 \\ &iii)\ z_1 z_2 (z_3 + z_4) + z_3 z_4 (z_1 + z_2) = -\omega\nu \\ &iv)\ z_1 z_2 z_3 z_4 = 1 - \omega. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Eliminating $z_1 + z_2$, $z_3 + z_4$ and $z_3 z_4$ from the equations of (3.6), setting $r = z_1 z_2 = |z_1(\omega)|^2$ and imposing the restriction

$$r \geq (1-\omega)^{1/2}, \tag{3.7}$$

to guarantee that at least when all z_j's, $j = 1(1)4$, are complex, z_1 and z_2 constitute the pair with the largest modulus, after some manipulation one obtains

$$(r^2 - (1-\omega))^2 \, (r^2 + (1-\omega)) - \omega^2 r^3 \nu^2 = 0. \tag{3.8}$$

Differentiating (3.8) with respect to ω, solving for $\frac{\partial r}{\partial \omega}$ and substituting into the resulting equation ν^2 from (3.8) we finally have

$$\frac{\partial r}{\partial \omega} = \frac{r[2r^4 - \omega r^2 - (1-\omega)(2+\omega)]}{\omega[3r^4 + 2(1-\omega)r^2 + 3(1-\omega)^2]}. \tag{3.9}$$

It is readily seen from (3.9), having in mind the restriction (3.7), that $r(\geq (1-\omega)^{1/2})$ becomes a minimum if and only if

$$r = ((\omega + (16 - 8\omega - 7\omega^2)^{1/2}) / 4)^{1/2}. \tag{3.10}$$

Since $\lim_{\omega \to 1^-} r = 1 / \sqrt{2}$, a continuity argument implies that even for $\omega \in (\omega_c, 1)$ the pair z_1, z_2 corresponds to the product of the two complex conjugate zeros of (2.1) and not to the corresponding one of the real zeros z_3 and z_4, because $z_3(1)\, z_4(1) = 0$. To simplify matters we follow a slightly different analysis from the one in case $p = 3$. For this, assume that $\omega \in (0, 1]$ is fixed and r varies, so that $r \geq ((\omega + (16 - 8\omega - 7\omega^2)^{1/2}) / 4)^{1/2}$, and satisfies (3.8). In this way r becomes a function of $\nu \in (0, \beta]$. Differentiating (3.8) with respect to ν and using again (3.8) into the resulting equation to eliminate ν^2 it is found out that

$$\frac{\partial r^2}{\partial \nu} = \frac{4\omega^2\, \nu\, r^5}{(r^4 + 3\,(1 - \omega)^2)\,(r^4 - (1 - \omega)^2)} > 0. \tag{3.11}$$

(3.11) suggests that $\max r$ or, in turn, $\max \mid z_1(\omega) \mid = \max \mid z_2(\omega) \mid$ is achieved for $\nu = \beta = \rho\,(T)$. So, putting β instead of ν in (3.8), that is considering

$$(r^2 - (1 - \omega))^2\, (r^2 + (1 - \omega)) - \omega^2\, r^3\, \beta^2 = 0, \tag{3.8'}$$

and repeating exactly the same argumentation as before we end up with (3.10) again, where the only difference now is that r refers to the $\max \mid z_j(\omega, \beta) \mid$, $j = 1, 2$. Rewriting (3.8)' in the form

$$h(\omega) := r^3\, \beta^2 - \left(\frac{r^2 - (1 - \omega)}{\omega}\right)^2 (r^2 + (1 - \omega)) = 0, \tag{3.12}$$

and using (3.10), it is readily obtained that

$$\begin{aligned} sign(h(0)) &= sign(\lim_{\omega \to 0^+} h(\omega)) = sign(\beta^2 - 2) \\ sign(h(1)) &= sign(\beta^2 - 1 / \sqrt{8}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Since, on the other hand, it can be found out from (3.10) that $\partial r / \partial \omega < 0$ and from

(3.12), after a modest amount of algebra takes place, that $\partial h / \partial \omega > 0$, and that $\partial \omega / \partial \beta < 0$, it is concluded that $r = \max | z_j(\omega, \beta) |^2$ (< 1), $j = 1, 2$, in (3.10) is minimized:

i) For $0 < \beta \le 1 / \sqrt[4]{8}$ when $\omega_d = 1$ ($r = \beta^{2/3} < 1$).

ii) For $1 / \sqrt[4]{8} < \beta < \sqrt{2}$ when ω_d, the unique real root of (3.12) or of (3.8)' in (0,1) ($r < 1$ is given in (3.10)), and

iii) For $\beta \ge \sqrt{2}$ when $\omega_d = 0$, (in which case $r = 1$).

It remains to be proven that if $\omega_d \in (\omega_c, 1)$ then $| z_3(\omega_c) | < | z_1(\omega_c) | = r^{1/2}$, where z_3 is the absolutely largest of the two real negative zeros z_3 and z_4 of (2.1) or of (3.6). From (3.6) one obtains, for $\omega = \omega_d$, that

$$\begin{aligned} z_3 + z_4 &= -\frac{(r^2 + 1 - \omega_d)^{1/2}}{r^{1/2}} \\ z_3 z_4 &= \frac{1 - \omega_d}{r}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Hence z_3 and z_4 are the roots of the quadratic

$$Z^2 + \frac{(r^2 + 1 - \omega_d)^{1/2}}{r^{1/2}} Z + \frac{1 - \omega_c}{r} = 0. \tag{3.15}$$

The modulus of the absolutely largest root of (3.15) is given by

$$| z_3 | = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{(r^2 + 1 - \omega_d)^{1/2} + [r^2 - 3(1 - \omega_d)]^{1/2}}{r^{1/2}} \right\}, \tag{3.16}$$

where, obviously, $r^2 \ge 3(1 - \omega_d)$ since z_3 and z_4 are real. A straightforward comparison shows that $r^{1/2} = | z_1 | > | z_3 |$ at $\omega = \omega_d$. Consequently $\omega_{opt} = \omega_d$, which concludes the proof in the present case $p = 4$ and therefore that of Theorem 1.

References

1. Chen, Y.T., *Iterative Methods for Linear Least-Squares Problems*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Computer Science, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 1975.
2. Galanis, S., A. Hadjidimos and D. Noutsos, "On the Equivalence of the k-Step Euler Methods and SOR Methods for k-Cyclic Matrices", *Math. Comput. Simulations*, 30 (1988), 213-230.
3. Kredell, B., "On Complex Successive Overrelaxation", *BIT* 2 (1962), 143-152.
4. Nichols, N.K. and L. Fox, "Generalized Consistent Ordering and the Optimum Successive Over-Relaxation Factor", *Numer. Math.* 13 (1969), 425-433.
5. Niethammer, W., J. de Pillis and R.S. Varga, "Convergence of Block Iterative Methods Applied to Sparse Least-Squares Problems", *Linear Algebra Appl.* 58 (1984) 327-341.
6. Plemmons, R.J., "Adjustments by Least Squares in Geodesy Using Block Iterative Methods for Sparse Matrices", in *Proceedings of the Annual U.S. Army Conference on Numerical Analysis and Computers*, pp. 151-186, 1979.
7. Varga, R.S., "p-Cyclic Matrices: A generalization of the Young-Frankel Successive Overrelaxation Scheme", *Pacific J. Math.* 9 (1959), 617-628.
8. Varga, R.S., *Matrix Iterative Analysis*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ 1962.
9. Verner, J.H. and M.J.M. Bernal, "On Generalizations of the Theory of Consistent Orderings for Successive Over-Relaxation Methods", *Numer. Math.* 12 (1968), 215-222.
10. Wild, P. and W. Niethammer, "Over- and Underrelaxation for Linear Systems with Weakly Cyclic Jacobi Matrices of Index p", *Linear Algebra Appl.* 91 (1987), 29-52.
11. Young, D.M., "Iterative Methods for Solving Partial Differential Equations of Elliptic Type", *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 76 (1954), 92-111.
12. Young, D.M., *Matrix Iterative Analysis*, Academic Press, New York, 1971.