

RESIDUAL INVERSE ITERATION FOR THE NONLINEAR EIGENVALUE PROBLEM*

A. NEUMAIERT

Abstract. For the nonlinear eigenvalue problem $A(\lambda)\hat{x} = 0$, where $A(\cdot)$ is a matrix-valued operator, residual inverse iteration with shift σ is defined by

$$e^{(i+1)} := \text{const.} (x^{(i)} - A(\sigma)^{-1}A(\lambda_{i+1})x^{(i)}),$$

where λ_{i+1} is an appropriate approximation of $\hat{\lambda}$. In the linear case, $A(\lambda) = A - \lambda I$, this is theoretically equivalent to ordinary inverse iteration, but the residual formulation results in a considerably higher limit accuracy when the residual $A(\lambda_{i+1})x^{(i)} = Ax^{(i)} - \lambda_{i+1}x^{(i)}$ is accumulated in double precision. In the nonlinear case, if σ is sufficiently close to $\hat{\lambda}$, convergence is at least linear with convergence factor proportional to $|\sigma - \hat{\lambda}|$. As with ordinary inverse iteration, the convergence can be accelerated by using variable shifts.

1. Introduction. Inverse iteration is generally considered as one of the standard methods for the computation of selected eigenpairs of a linear eigenvalue problem. Although it is best analyzed in terms of eigenvector expansions (see e.g. Wilkinson [11]), local convergence can also be proved by deriving inverse iteration from Newton's method applied to a suitable equivalent system of nonlinear equations (Unger [10]). To treat the more general nonlinear eigenvalue problem, this latter approach can be generalized and leads to a nonlinear version of inverse iteration for the eigenvalue problem $A(\lambda)x = 0$, $x \neq 0$, namely

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} y^{(i)} &= A(\lambda_i)^{-1}A(\lambda_i)x^{(i)}, \\ x^{(i+1)} &= y^{(i)} / e^* y^{(i)}, \quad \lambda_{i+1} = \lambda_i - 1/e^* y^{(i)}. \end{aligned}$$

The numerical behaviour of this and other related methods is discussed in the survey by Ruhe [6]. An essential disadvantage of these methods is the fact that in each step the coefficient matrix $A(\lambda_i)$ of the linear system for $y^{(i)}$ changes; and, in contrast to the linear case, working with a fixed "shift" σ instead of λ_i results in convergence to the wrong problem, namely to a solution of the linearized problem $A(\lambda^*)x = (A^* - \sigma)A(\lambda^*)x$.

In the following, we circumvent this difficulty by considering a variant of inverse iteration based on the use of the residual. To motivate the new approach we rearrange (1) such that

$$\begin{aligned} x^{(i+1)} &= x^{(i)} - dx^{(i)} \\ &= x^{(i)} - x^{(i)} - x^{(i+1)} + (\lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i)y^{(i)} \\ &= x^{(i)} + (\lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i)A(\lambda_i)^{-1}A(\lambda_i)x^{(i)} \\ &= A(\lambda_i)^{-1}(A(\lambda_i) + (\lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i)A(\lambda_i))x^{(i)} \\ &= A(\lambda_i)^{-1}A(\lambda_{i+1})x^{(i)} + O((\lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i)^2), \end{aligned}$$

is computed from $x^{(i)}$ by subtracting the correction term

$$dx^{(i)} = x^{(i)} - x^{(i+1)}$$

if $A(\lambda)$ is twice continuously differentiable. By neglecting the error term we obtain for $x^{(i+1)}$ the expression

$$(2) \quad x^{(i+1)} = x^{(i)} - A(\lambda_i)^{-1}A(\lambda_{i+1})x^{(i)},$$

where the new approximation λ_{i+1} for the eigenvalue now has to be determined beforehand (we shall use a generalized Rayleigh quotient). It turns out that in this formulation λ_i may be replaced by a constant "shift" σ without destroying convergence to the wanted eigenpair.

The new algorithm, called residual inverse iteration, thus computes the new approximation $x^{(i+1)}$ by applying to $x^{(i)}$ a correction term computed from the residual $A(\lambda)x^{(i)}$ for a suitable λ . Hence in the presence of rounding errors residual inverse iteration with double precision accumulation of the residuals gives about the same limit accuracy as one would get with ordinary inverse iteration only when the complete iteration is performed in double precision. In particular, for linear problems, residual inverse iteration can be profitably used to refine eigenvalue approximations obtained from the QR or QZ algorithm (see e.g. Stewart [8]) since the single precision partial factorization available from the QR or QZ algorithm can be reused to save factorization time. Thus residual inverse iteration provides a simple alternative to some refinement procedures proposed in the literature ([1], [2], § 62], [9], [12]), and has the advantage of preserving the structure of A and not requiring an initial eigenvector approximation.

In case that $A(\lambda) = A - \lambda I$, residual inverse iteration is again theoretically equivalent to ordinary inverse iteration. But in the nonlinear case, residual inverse iteration is no longer strictly equivalent to (1), and can be used either with a fixed shift σ or with variable shift. For the fixed shift, local convergence is at least linear with a convergence factor proportional to the distance of σ to the nearest eigenvalue $\hat{\lambda}$ (provided that $\hat{\lambda}$ is simple and isolated). Double precision computation of the residuals again leads (in well-conditioned cases) to results which are correct to almost double precision.

The paper is organized as follows. In § 2, residual inverse iteration is defined for fixed shift. Section 3 gives the local convergence proof, with some remarks on the convergence behaviour in case of variable shifts. In § 4, we comment on the practical realization and demonstrate the behaviour of the algorithm with three examples: the Frank matrix of order 11 and two definite quadratic eigenvalue problems of Scott and Ward [7]. We use the notation $C^{n \times n}$ for the set of complex square $n \times n$ -matrices, denote conjugate transposition by an asterisk $*$, and use $\|\cdot\|$ for an arbitrary vector norm.

2. The algorithm. We consider the finite-dimensional nonlinear eigenvalue problem

$$(3) \quad A(\hat{\lambda})\hat{x} = 0, \quad \hat{\lambda} \in D \subseteq \mathbb{C}, \quad \hat{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n - \{0\},$$

where $A: D \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ is a continuous matrix-valued map. We suppose that an approximation $\sigma \in D$ to $\hat{\lambda}$ is known, that $A(\sigma)$ is nonsingular, and that e is a normalization vector such that

$$(4) \quad e^* \hat{x} = 1;$$

usually e will be the unit vector with a 1 in the position of the largest entry of \hat{x} . We suggest the following iteration for the approximation of a solution of (3).

Residual inverse iteration.

Step 1. Put $l = 0$, and compute an initial approximation $x^{(0)}$ to \hat{x} as the normalized solution of the equation

$$(5) \quad A(\sigma)x^{(l+1)} = b, \quad x^{(l+1)} := \bar{x}^{(0)} / e^* \bar{x}^{(0)},$$

the vector $b \neq 0$ has to be chosen suitably (see § 4).

* Received by the editors February 21, 1984, and in revised form September 7, 1984.
† Institut für Angewandte Mathematik, Universität Freiburg, D-7800 Freiburg, West Germany.

Step 2. Compute an improved approximation λ_{i+1} to $\hat{\lambda}$ by solving one of the equations

$$(6a) \quad x^{(i)*} A(\lambda_{i+1}) x^{(i)} = 0 \quad \text{or}$$

$$(6b) \quad e^* A(\sigma)^{-1} A(\lambda_{i+1}) x^{(i)} = 0.$$

Formula (6a) is appropriate only when $A(\lambda)$ is Hermitian and λ_i is real; otherwise, (6b) has to be used. The root closest to λ_i is accepted as λ_{i+1} .

Step 3. Compute the residual

$$(7) \quad r^{(i)} := A(\lambda_{i+1}) x^{(i)}.$$

Step 4. Compute an improved approximation $x^{(i+1)}$ to \hat{x} by solving the equation

$$(8) \quad A(\sigma) dx^{(i)} = r^{(i)}$$

and normalizing the vector

$$(9) \quad \tilde{x}^{(i+1)} := x^{(i)} - dx^{(i)}, \quad x^{(i+1)} := \tilde{x}^{(i+1)} / e^* \tilde{x}^{(i+1)}.$$

Step 5. Increase i by one and return to Step 2.

In the special case $A(\lambda) = A - \lambda I$, residual inverse iteration is equivalent to ordinary inverse iteration with shift σ (in the absence of rounding errors); indeed we then have

$$\begin{aligned} (A - \sigma I) \tilde{x}^{(i+1)} &:= (A - \sigma I) x^{(i)} - (A - \sigma I) dx^{(i)} \\ &= (A - \sigma I) x^{(i)} - (A - \lambda_{i+1} I) x^{(i)} \\ &= (\lambda_{i+1} - \sigma) x^{(i)}, \end{aligned}$$

so that $\tilde{x}^{(i+1)}$, and hence $x^{(i+1)}$, is parallel to $(A - \sigma I)^{-1} x^{(i)}$. Thus we can hope that in the more general situation discussed above, some of the excellent convergence properties of inverse iteration (as discussed e.g. in Wilkinson [11], Parlett [5]) are still valid.

3. Convergence analysis. In this section we shall assume that the matrix function $A(\lambda)$ is twice continuously differentiable in some neighbourhood U of $\hat{\lambda}$. Then the divided difference

$$A[\lambda_1, \lambda_2] := \begin{cases} \frac{A(\lambda_2) - A(\lambda_1)}{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1} & \text{if } \lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2, \\ A'(\lambda_1) & \text{if } \lambda_1 = \lambda_2. \end{cases}$$

is defined in U , is continuously differentiable and satisfies the relations

$$A(\lambda_2) = A(\lambda_1) + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) A[\lambda_1, \lambda_2], \quad A[\lambda_1, \lambda_2] = A'(\hat{\lambda}) + O(\lambda_1 - \hat{\lambda}, \lambda_2 - \hat{\lambda}).$$

If $A(\hat{\lambda})$ is singular we call each vector $\tilde{x} \neq 0$ satisfying $A(\hat{\lambda})\tilde{x} = 0$ a right eigenvector associated with $\hat{\lambda}$, and each vector $\tilde{y} \neq 0$ satisfying $\tilde{y}^* A(\hat{\lambda}) = 0$ a left eigenvector associated with $\hat{\lambda}$.

PROPOSITION 1. The following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) $d(\lambda) := \det A(\lambda)$ has a simple zero at $\lambda = \hat{\lambda}$;
- (ii) $A(\hat{\lambda})$ has corank 1, and for any pair \tilde{x}, \tilde{y} of right and left eigenvectors,

$$(10) \quad \tilde{y}^* A'(\hat{\lambda}) \tilde{x} \neq 0.$$

Proof. Suppose first that $A(\hat{\lambda})$ has corank 1. Since the adjoint matrix $C := \text{Adj } A(\hat{\lambda})$ satisfies $C A(\hat{\lambda}) = A(\hat{\lambda}) C = 0$, the columns of C are multiples of \tilde{x} , and the rows of C are multiples of \tilde{y}^* . Therefore $C = \gamma \tilde{y}^*$ for a suitable constant γ , and

since some $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ minor of $A(\hat{\lambda})$ is nonzero, $C \neq 0$ whence $\gamma \neq 0$. Now by Gröbner [3, eq. (4.76)],

$$\begin{aligned} d(\lambda) &= \det A(\lambda) = \det (A(\hat{\lambda}) + (\lambda - \hat{\lambda}) A[\lambda, \hat{\lambda}]) \\ &= \det A(\hat{\lambda}) + (\lambda - \hat{\lambda}) \text{tr} (\text{Adj } A(\hat{\lambda}) \cdot A[\lambda, \hat{\lambda}]) + O(\lambda - \hat{\lambda})^2 \\ &= (\lambda - \hat{\lambda}) \text{tr} (C A[\lambda, \hat{\lambda}]) + O(\lambda - \hat{\lambda})^2 \\ &= (\lambda - \hat{\lambda}) \text{tr} (\gamma \tilde{y}^* A'(\hat{\lambda})) + O(\lambda - \hat{\lambda})^2 \\ &= (\lambda - \hat{\lambda}) \gamma \cdot \tilde{y}^* A'(\hat{\lambda}) \tilde{x} + O(\lambda - \hat{\lambda})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence in this case, (i) and (ii) are equivalent.

Suppose now that $A(\hat{\lambda})$ has corank $s \neq 1$. If $s = 0$ then $d(\hat{\lambda}) \neq 0$ and neither (i) nor (ii) holds. And if $s \geq 2$ then all $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ minors of $A(\hat{\lambda})$ are zero whence $C = 0$ and, as above, $d(\lambda) = O(\lambda - \hat{\lambda})^2$. Again neither (i) nor (ii) holds. This proves the proposition. \square

We shall call $\hat{\lambda}$ a simple isolated eigenvalue of the matrix function $A(\lambda)$ if $A(\lambda)$ is twice continuously differentiable in some neighbourhood of $\hat{\lambda}$ and the conditions (i) and (ii) of Proposition 1 are satisfied.

PROPOSITION 2. Let $\hat{\lambda}$ be a simple isolated eigenvalue of $A(\lambda)$, and let \tilde{x} be a corresponding right eigenvector normalized such that $e^* \tilde{x} = 1$. Then the matrix

$$(11) \quad B := A(\hat{\lambda}) + A'(\hat{\lambda}) \tilde{x} e^*$$

is nonsingular.

Proof. Assume that $Bx = 0$. Then, with a left eigenvector \tilde{y} , we have $0 = \tilde{y}^* Bx = \tilde{y}^* A(\hat{\lambda})x + \tilde{y}^* A'(\hat{\lambda}) \tilde{x} e^* x = \tilde{y}^* A(\hat{\lambda}) \tilde{x} \cdot e^* x$, and by (10) then $e^* x = 0$. Therefore $A(\hat{\lambda})x = Bx - A'(\hat{\lambda}) \tilde{x} e^* x = 0$, and $x = ix$ for suitable i since $A(\hat{\lambda})$ has corank 1. Now $i = ie^* \tilde{x} = e^* x = 0$ implies $x = 0$. Since x was arbitrary, B is nonsingular. \square

PROPOSITION 3. With the assumptions of Proposition 2, suppose that for sufficiently small $\delta \gg \varepsilon > 0$, we have $0 < |\sigma - \hat{\lambda}| \leq \delta$ and

$$\lambda = \hat{\lambda} + O(\varepsilon), \quad x = \tilde{x} + O(\varepsilon).$$

Then $A(\sigma)$ is nonsingular, and if $\sigma \neq \lambda$ then the vector

$$(12) \quad \tilde{x} := x - A(\sigma)^{-1} A(\lambda) x$$

satisfies

$$(13) \quad 0 \neq e^* \tilde{x} = \frac{\sigma - \hat{\lambda}}{\sigma - \lambda} (1 + O(\varepsilon)),$$

$$(14) \quad \tilde{x} / e^* \tilde{x} = \tilde{x} + (\sigma - \hat{\lambda}) O(\varepsilon).$$

Proof. If $\sigma \neq \hat{\lambda}$ is in a sufficiently small neighbourhood of the simple eigenvalue $\hat{\lambda}$ then $\det A(\sigma) \neq 0$ whence $A(\sigma)$ is nonsingular. Define

$$(15) \quad S := A(\sigma) + (1 - \sigma + \hat{\lambda}) A[\sigma, \hat{\lambda}] \tilde{x} e^*.$$

Then, with B defined by (13),

$$\begin{aligned} S &= B + A(\sigma) - A(\hat{\lambda}) + (A[\sigma, \lambda] - A'(\hat{\lambda}) - (\sigma - \hat{\lambda}) A[\sigma, \hat{\lambda}]) \tilde{x} e^* \\ &= B + O(\sigma - \hat{\lambda}), \end{aligned}$$

and since B is nonsingular by Proposition 2, S is nonsingular, and

$$(16) \quad S^{-1} = B^{-1} + O(\sigma - \hat{\lambda}) = O(1).$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} S\hat{x} &= (A(\sigma) - A(\hat{\lambda}))\hat{x} + (1 - \sigma + \hat{\lambda})A[\sigma, \hat{\lambda}]\hat{x}e^* \hat{x} \\ &= (\sigma - \hat{\lambda})A[\sigma, \hat{\lambda}]\hat{x} + (1 - \sigma + \hat{\lambda})A[\sigma, \hat{\lambda}]\hat{x}, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$(17) \quad A[\sigma, \hat{\lambda}]\hat{x} = S\hat{x}.$$

Since $e^*(\bar{x} - e^* \bar{x} \cdot \hat{x}) = e^* \bar{x} - e^* \bar{x} \cdot e^* \hat{x} = 0$, (15), (12), and (17) imply

$$\begin{aligned} z &:= S(\bar{x} - e^* \bar{x} \cdot \hat{x}) = A(\sigma)(x - e^* \bar{x} \cdot \hat{x}) \\ &= A(\sigma)\bar{x} - e^* \bar{x} \cdot A(\sigma)\hat{x} \\ &= (A(\sigma) - A(\hat{\lambda}))x - e^* \bar{x}(A(\sigma) - A(\hat{\lambda}))\hat{x} \\ &= (\sigma - \lambda)A[\sigma, \lambda]x - e^* \bar{x}(\sigma - \hat{\lambda})A[\sigma, \hat{\lambda}]\hat{x} \\ &= (\sigma - \lambda)(A[\sigma, \hat{\lambda}]\hat{x} + O(\epsilon)) - e^* \bar{x}(\sigma - \hat{\lambda})A[\sigma, \hat{\lambda}]\hat{x} \\ &= (\sigma - \lambda)(S\hat{x} + O(\epsilon)) - e^* \bar{x}(\sigma - \hat{\lambda})S\hat{x}. \end{aligned}$$

By (16), this implies

$$(18) \quad \bar{x} - e^* \bar{x} \cdot \hat{x} = S^{-1}z = (\sigma - \lambda)(\hat{x} + O(\epsilon)) - e^* \bar{x}(\sigma - \hat{\lambda})\hat{x}.$$

Multiplication with e^* gives

$$0 = (\sigma - \lambda)(1 + O(\epsilon)) - e^* \bar{x}(\sigma - \hat{\lambda})$$

which implies (13) and $\sigma - \lambda = e^* \bar{x}(\sigma - \hat{\lambda})(1 + O(\epsilon))$. Insertion into (18) and division by $e^* \bar{x}$ finally gives $\bar{x}/e^* \bar{x} - \hat{x} = (\sigma - \hat{\lambda})O(\epsilon)$ which implies (14). \square

PROPOSITION 4. Under the assumptions of Proposition 2, if, for sufficiently small $\delta \geq \epsilon > 0$ we have $0 < |\sigma - \hat{\lambda}| \leq \delta$ and $x^{(t)} = \hat{x} + O(\epsilon)$, then the zero of (6b) closest to $\hat{\lambda}$ satisfies

$$(19) \quad \lambda_{t+1} = \hat{\lambda} + O(\epsilon);$$

and in case that $A(\lambda)$ is Hermitian and $\hat{\lambda}$ is real then the zero of (6a) closest to $\hat{\lambda}$ satisfies

$$(20) \quad \lambda_{t+1} = \hat{\lambda} + O(\epsilon^2).$$

Proof. Write $\bar{y} = e^* A(\sigma)^{-1}$, $y = \bar{y}/\|\bar{y}\|$, and consider the function $f(\lambda) := y^* A(\lambda)x^{(t)}$. For $\delta, \epsilon \rightarrow 0$, $A(\sigma)$ approaches $A(\hat{\lambda})$ whence y approaches a left nullvector \hat{y} of $A(\hat{\lambda})$, i.e. a left eigenvector corresponding to $\hat{\lambda}$, and $f(\lambda)$ approaches the function $\hat{f}(\lambda) := \hat{y}^* A(\lambda)\hat{x}$ which has a simple zero at $\hat{\lambda}$. Therefore if δ is sufficiently small, $f(\lambda)$ has a simple zero λ_{t-1} close to $\hat{\lambda}$. Now $0 = f(\lambda_{t+1}) = f(\hat{\lambda}) + (\lambda_{t+1} - \hat{\lambda})f'(\xi)$ for some ξ near $\hat{\lambda}$ whence

$$\lambda_{t+1} = \hat{\lambda} + \frac{f(\hat{\lambda})}{f'(\xi)} = \hat{\lambda} + O(f(\hat{\lambda}))$$

since $f'(\xi)$ is bounded away from zero (near $\hat{\lambda}$). But

$$f(\hat{\lambda}) = y^* A(\hat{\lambda})x^{(t)} = y^* A(\hat{\lambda})(x^{(t)} - \hat{x}) = O(\epsilon),$$

so that (19) holds. (20) is proved in the same way with $\bar{y} = x^{(t)}$, observing that in the Hermitian case $\bar{y} := \hat{x}$ is a left eigenvector, and \square

$f(\hat{\lambda}) = x^{(t)*} A(\hat{\lambda})x^{(t)} = (x^{(t)} - \hat{x})^* A(\hat{\lambda})(x^{(t)} - \hat{x}) = O(\epsilon^2)$. With the observation that for $\sigma \rightarrow \hat{\lambda}$ the solution $x^{(t)}$ of (5) converges to \hat{x} , Propositions 3 and 4 lead to the following local convergence theorem.

THEOREM. Let $\hat{\lambda}$ be a simple isolated eigenvalue of $A(\lambda)$, and suppose that there is a corresponding eigenvector \hat{x} normalized such that $e^* \hat{x} = 1$. Then the residual inverse iteration converges for all σ sufficiently close to $\hat{\lambda}$, and we have

$$\frac{\|x^{(t+1)} - \hat{x}\|}{\|x^{(t)} - \hat{x}\|} = O(\sigma - \hat{\lambda}), \quad \|\lambda^{(t+1)} - \hat{\lambda}\| = O(\|x^{(t)} - \hat{x}\|^t),$$

where $t = 1$ if (6b) is used, and $t = 2$ if $A(\lambda)$ is Hermitian, $\hat{\lambda}$ is real, and (6a) is used. \square The theorem implies local linear convergence with a convergence factor proportional to $|\sigma - \hat{\lambda}|$. In particular, this suggests that the convergence is accelerated by updating the shift σ in each iteration step (or in some iteration steps only, if the extra work to refactor $A(\sigma)$ is considered as being too much). It follows easily from the theorem that we have quadratic convergence (and in the Hermitian case with real $\hat{\lambda}$ even cubic convergence) if in each iteration step, σ is replaced by the most recent value of λ_t .

4. Numerical examples. For the actual computation on a computer, several remarks are in place. (5) is usually solved by using a factorization

$$(21a) \quad A(\sigma) = SR,$$

where R is upper triangular, and S is a permuted lower unit triangular or orthogonal matrix. An appropriate choice of b is then the vector $b = S_j$, $j = (1, \dots, 1)^*$, so that we actually solve

$$(5a) \quad R\bar{x}^{(t)} = (1, \dots, 1)^*, \quad x^{(t)} = \bar{x}^{(t)}/e^* \bar{x}^{(t)}$$

in place of (5). This choice is motivated in Wilkinson [11] for ordinary inverse iteration and works well in the present algorithm.

In the special case that $A(\lambda)$ is linear in λ , and the QR (or QZ) algorithm has been used to compute the eigenvalues (cf. Wilkinson [11], Parlett [5], Stewart [8]), a factorization

$$(21b) \quad A(\sigma) = Q_1 B(\sigma) Q_2$$

with orthogonal Q_1, Q_2 and Hessenberg (or tridiagonal) $B(\sigma)$ is already available, and it may be more economical to factor $B(\sigma)$ instead:

$$(21c) \quad B(\sigma) = S'R'$$

and solve

$$(5b) \quad R'\bar{x}^{(t)} = (1, \dots, 1)^*, \quad x^{(t)} = Q_2 \bar{x}^{(t)}, \quad \bar{x}^{(t)} = \bar{x}^{(t)}/e^* \bar{x}^{(t)}$$

in place of (5).

It is a useful fact that the factorization can be reused to find the vector $e^* A(\sigma)^{-1}$ required in (6b) as

$$(22a) \quad e^* A(\sigma)^{-1} = e^* R^{-1} S'^{-1} \text{ using (21a), or}$$

$$(22b) \quad e^* A(\sigma)^{-1} = e^* Q_2 R'^{-1} S'^{-1} Q_1^* \text{ using (21b, c)}$$

