Engineering Physics and Mathematics Division
Mathematical Sciences Section

**A NEW KRYLOV-SUBSPACE METHOD
FOR SYMMETRIC INDEFINITE LINEAR SYSTEMS**

Roland W. Freund [†]
Noël M. Nachtigal [‡]

[†] AT&T Bell Laboratories
Room 2C-420
600 Mountain Avenue
Murray Hill, NJ 07974-0636
freund@research.att.com

[‡] Mathematical Sciences Section
Oak Ridge National Laboratory
P.O. Box 2008, Bldg. 6012
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6367
santa@msr.epm.ornl.gov

Date Published: October, 1994

Research was supported in part by the Applied Mathematical Sciences Research Program of the Office of Energy Research, U.S. Department of Energy and by the Research Institute for Advanced Computer Science (RIACS), NASA Ames Research Center, Moffett Field.

Prepared by the
Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831
managed by
Martin Marietta Energy Systems, Inc.
for the
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
under Contract No. DE-AC05-84OR21400

MASTER

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, make any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	The QMR Method for Non-Hermitian Linear Systems	2
3	Simplification of the Lanczos Process	3
4	The Symmetric QMR Algorithm	4
5	Numerical Examples	5
6	References	7

A NEW KRYLOV-SUBSPACE METHOD FOR SYMMETRIC INDEFINITE LINEAR SYSTEMS

Roland W. Freund

Noël M. Nachtigal

Abstract

Many important applications involve the solution of large linear systems with symmetric, but indefinite coefficient matrices. For example, such systems arise in incompressible flow computations and as subproblems in optimization algorithms for linear and nonlinear programs. Existing Krylov-subspace iterations for symmetric indefinite systems, such as SYMMLQ and MINRES, require the use of symmetric positive definite preconditioners, which is a rather unnatural restriction when the matrix itself is highly indefinite with both many positive and many negative eigenvalues. In this note, we describe a new Krylov-subspace iteration for solving symmetric indefinite linear systems that can be combined with arbitrary symmetric preconditioners. The algorithm can be interpreted as a special case of the quasi-minimal residual method for general non-Hermitian linear systems, and like the latter, it produces iterates defined by a quasi-minimal residual property. The proposed method has the same work and storage requirements per iteration as SYMMLQ or MINRES, however, it usually converges in considerably fewer iterations. Results of numerical experiments are reported.

1. Introduction

The solution of large linear systems

$$Ax = b, \quad (1)$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is symmetric, but indefinite, is required in many important applications. Often the matrix A is *highly indefinite*, i.e., it has both many positive and many negative eigenvalues. For example, consider the Stokes problem of determining the velocity field $\mathbf{u}$ and pressure p of an incompressible fluid in a flow region $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d = 2, 3$. The flow is described by the coupled partial differential equations

$$\begin{aligned} -\nu \nabla^2 \mathbf{u} + \text{grad } p &= \mathbf{f} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ \text{div } \mathbf{u} &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ &+ \text{appropriate boundary conditions,} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\nu > 0$ denotes the viscosity of the fluid. Finite-difference or finite-element approximations of (2), possibly using stabilized discretizations, lead to linear systems (1) with symmetric matrices A of the form

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} B & C^T \\ C & -D \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = B^T \in \mathbb{R}^m, \quad D = D^T \in \mathbb{R}^{N-m}; \quad (3)$$

see, e.g., [10,14]. The matrix B in (3) represents the discretization of the term $-\nu \nabla^2 \mathbf{u}$ in (2), and thus B is positive definite. Furthermore, the matrix C in (3) usually has full row rank, and D is a positive semi-definite matrix. These properties imply that A is an indefinite matrix with m positive and $N-m$ negative eigenvalues. Note that $N-m \approx m/d$, and therefore, the matrix A is highly indefinite.

Linear systems (1) with coefficient matrices of the form (3) (often with C the zero matrix) also arise as subproblems in optimization algorithms, such as interior-point methods for linear and nonlinear programs, or sequential programming methods for constrained nonlinear programs; see, e.g., [4,9]. Again, the matrix A is typically highly indefinite.

The standard conjugate gradient-type Krylov-subspace algorithms for the iterative solution of symmetric indefinite linear systems are SYMMLQ and MINRES due to Paige and Saunders [13]. Both SYMMLQ and MINRES are based on the Lanczos process for symmetric matrices. Consequently, when preconditioning is used, then the coefficient matrix of the preconditioned systems needs to be symmetric. This condition implies that the preconditioner itself needs to be a symmetric positive definite matrix. This restriction for the choice of possible preconditioners for SYMMLQ and MINRES is rather unnatural when the coefficient matrix itself is highly indefinite. In this note, we describe a new iterative method for solving symmetric indefinite linear systems that can be combined with arbitrary symmetric preconditioners. The algorithm can be interpreted as a special case of the quasi-minimal residual (QMR) method [5,6] for general non-Hermitian linear systems, and like the latter, it generates iterates defined by a quasi-minimal residual property. The

proposed method has the same work and storage requirements per iteration as SYMMLQ or MINRES, however, it usually converges in considerably fewer iterations.

2. The QMR Method for Non-Hermitian Linear Systems

In this section, we briefly recall the QMR method [5,6] for the solution of linear systems (1), where $A \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ is now allowed to be any nonsingular, in general non-Hermitian, matrix.

Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{C}^N$ be an arbitrary initial guess for (1), let $r_0 := b - Ax_0$ be the associated residual vector, and set $v_1 = r_0 / \|r_0\|_2$. Moreover, let $w_1 \in \mathbb{C}^N$ be an arbitrary vector with $\|w_1\|_2 = 1$. The original QMR algorithm proposed in [5] uses the look-ahead variant [3] of the classical Lanczos process [11] to generate two sequences of so-called Lanczos vectors

$$\{v_j\}_{j=1}^n \quad \text{and} \quad \{w_j\}_{j=1}^n, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots,$$

that span the Krylov subspaces

$$K_n(A, r_0) := \text{span}\{r_0, Ar_0, \dots, A^{n-1}r_0\}$$

and

$$K_n(A^T, w_1) := \text{span}\{w_1, A^T w_1, \dots, (A^T)^{n-1} w_1\},$$

respectively. These vectors are constructed to be block-biorthogonal; for example, if no look-ahead steps occur, then they are even biorthogonal, i.e.,

$$w_j^T v_k = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad j \neq k = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

We mention that, in our implementation of the look-ahead Lanczos algorithm, the Lanczos vectors are always scaled to unit length:

$$\|v_n\|_2 = \|w_n\|_2 = 1 \quad \text{for all} \quad n.$$

The Lanczos vectors can be generated by means of short vector recurrences. For the *right* Lanczos vectors $\{v_j\}_{j=1}^{n+1}$, these recursions can be summarized compactly in the relation

$$AV_n = V_{n+1}T_n. \tag{4}$$

Here, $V_n := [v_1 \ v_2 \ \dots \ v_n]$, and T_n is an $(n+1) \times n$ matrix whose entries are the coefficients of the Lanczos recursions. The matrix T_n is both block tridiagonal and upper Hessenberg, and it always has full rank n . Setting $W_n := [w_1 \ w_2 \ \dots \ w_n]$, the recurrences for the *left* Lanczos vectors $\{w_j\}_{j=1}^{n+1}$ can be summarized in the relation

$$A^T W_n = W_{n+1} \tilde{T}_n.$$

Here, $\tilde{T}_n$ is again a block tridiagonal $(n+1) \times n$ matrix that is also upper Hessenberg.

The QMR method is a Krylov-subspace iteration, i.e., it produces a sequence of approximations to the solution of (1) of the form

$$x_n \in x_0 + K_n(A, r_0), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Since the right Lanczos vectors $\{v_j\}_{j=1}^n$ span $K_n(A, r_0)$, any possible iterate can be written as

$$x_n = x_0 + V_n z_n, \quad \text{where } z_n \in \mathbb{C}^n,$$

and z_n is a free parameter vector. In QMR, z_n is chosen as the (unique) solution of the least-squares problem

$$\|f_n - T_n z_n\|_2 = \min_{z \in \mathbb{C}^n} \|f_n - T_n z\|_2, \quad \text{where } f_n := [\|r_0\|_2 \quad 0 \quad \dots \quad 0]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}. \quad (5)$$

We remark that, by (4), the residual vector of the n th QMR iterate x_n is given by

$$b - Ax_n = V_{n+1} (f_n - T_n z_n). \quad (6)$$

Hence, in view of (5), the QMR iterate x_n is characterized by a minimization of the second factor in the representation (6) of its residual vector. This is called a *quasi-minimal residual* (QMR) property, and the resulting iterative scheme for solving linear systems (1) is the QMR method. The solution of the least-squares problem (5) and the QMR iterates can be easily updated from step to step, using only short vector updates; see [5]. It is also possible to replace the three-term look-ahead Lanczos algorithm by a coupled two-term look-ahead Lanczos algorithm; the resulting implementation of QMR is discussed in [6]. Finally, a very simple no-look-ahead version of the coupled two-term QMR algorithm was derived by Freund and Szeto in [7]. They showed that the no-look-ahead QMR iterates can be obtained from the classical biconjugate gradient (BCG) algorithm [12] by performing one additional vector update and a few scalar updates at each BCG iteration. The resulting algorithm is called "QMR-from-BCG".

3. Simplification of the Lanczos Process

The Lanczos process requires matrix-vector products $A \cdot v$ for the construction of the right Lanczos vectors, as well as products $A^T \cdot w$ with the transpose A^T for the construction of the left Lanczos vectors. Freund and Zha [2,8] observed that the Lanczos process (and thus the QMR method) simplifies if one knows a nonsingular matrix P with

$$A^T P = P A, \quad (7)$$

and if the initial vector w_1 is chosen as $w_1 = Pv_1/\|Pv_1\|_2$. In fact, it can be shown that the Lanczos vectors satisfy

$$w_n = \frac{Pv_n}{\|Pv_n\|_2} \quad \text{for all } n.$$

Therefore, each matrix-vector product with A^T can be replaced by a matrix-vector multiplication with P . In particular, if the computation of products with P is cheap, then the resulting simplified Lanczos algorithm, as well as the QMR method, requires only half the work and storage of the general Lanczos process. For example, if P is a sparse matrix, then computing products with P is cheap. There are also important cases of dense matrices for which matrix-vector products $P \cdot v$ can be computed efficiently; for instance, this is the case if P is a Toeplitz matrix, see [8].

4. The Symmetric QMR Algorithm

We now return to linear systems (1) with symmetric indefinite coefficient matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$. Let $M = M^T \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ be an arbitrary nonsingular matrix that we want to use as a preconditioner for (1). To allow for left, right, or two-sided preconditioning, we write the preconditioner M in the form $M = M_1 \cdot M_2$. We stress that M_1 and M_2 are arbitrary matrices such that

$$M = M_1 M_2 = M_2^T M_1^T = M^T,$$

and M_1 and M_2 need not be the transpose of each other. Then, instead of (1), we solve the equivalent preconditioned system

$$A'x' = b', \quad \text{where } A' = M_1^{-1}AM_2^{-1}, \quad x' = M_2x, \quad \text{and } b' = M_1^{-1}b. \quad (8)$$

Note that $M_1 = I$ for right preconditioning, and $M_2 = I$ for left preconditioning. We now set $P := M_1^T M_2^{-1}$. Using $A = A^T$ and $M_1 M_2 = M_2^T M_1^T$, one readily verifies that

$$(A')^T P = M_2^{-T} A M_2^{-1} = M_1^T M_2^{-1} M_1^{-1} A M_2^{-1} = P A',$$

i.e., the matrix A' satisfies the relation (7). Consequently, the QMR algorithm applied to (8) simplifies. Furthermore, by rewriting the resulting QMR algorithm in terms of the original system (1), it can be seen that the multiplications with P need not be done explicitly. In fact, the matrices M_1 and M_2 appear in the algorithm only in the usual preconditioning solves of systems of the form $M_1 r = t$ and $M_2 u = t$. We refer to the resulting QMR method for symmetric indefinite systems (1) with symmetric preconditioners M as the *symmetric QMR algorithm*.

A simple no-look-ahead version of the symmetric QMR algorithm derived from Freund and Szeto's QMR-from-BCG can be stated as follows.

Algorithm 1. (Symmetric QMR without look-ahead for $Ax = b$ with preconditioner $M = M_1 M_2$)

0) Choose $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

Set $r_0 = b - Ax_0$, $t = M_1^{-1}r_0$, $\tau_0 = \|t\|_2$, $q_0 = M_2^{-1}t$, $\vartheta_0 = 0$, and $\rho_0 = r_0^T q_0$.

For $n = 1, 2, \dots$, do :

1) Compute

$$t = Aq_{n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{n-1} = q_{n-1}^T t.$$

If $\sigma_{n-1} = 0$, then stop.

Otherwise, set

$$\alpha_{n-1} = \frac{\rho_{n-1}}{\sigma_{n-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad r_n = r_{n-1} - \alpha_{n-1}t.$$

2) Set

$$t = M_1^{-1}r_n, \quad \vartheta_n = \frac{\|t\|_2}{\tau_{n-1}}, \quad c_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \vartheta_n^2}}, \quad \tau_n = \tau_{n-1}\vartheta_n c_n,$$

$$d_n = c_n^2 \vartheta_{n-1}^2 d_{n-1} + c_n^2 \alpha_{n-1} q_{n-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad x_n = x_{n-1} + d_n.$$

If x_n has converged, then stop.

3) If $\rho_{n-1} = 0$, then stop.

Otherwise, set

$$u_n = M_2^{-1}t, \quad \rho_n = r_n^T u_n, \quad \beta_n = \frac{\rho_n}{\rho_{n-1}}, \quad \text{and} \quad q_n = u_n + \beta_n q_{n-1}.$$

We remark that, in Algorithm 1, r_n denotes the BCG residual, and not the residual vector associated with the n th QMR iterates x_n . Furthermore, $u_n = M^{-1}r_n = M_2^{-1}(M_1^{-1}r_n)$ is the preconditioned BCG residual.

5. Numerical Examples

We performed extensive numerical tests with Algorithm 1 for symmetric, highly indefinite linear systems arising in fluid flow computations and as subproblems within optimization algorithms. We now present two typical examples.

The first example is a linear system (1) with A of the form (3) that results from a finite-element approximation of a Stokes problem of the type (2), using the stabilized discretization from [14]. The matrix A is of the order 1634 with 1122 positive and 512 negative eigenvalues. The preconditioner M was chosen as the diagonal of A , and it was applied from the right, i.e., $M_1 = I$ and $M_2 = M$ in (8). In Figure 1, we show the relative residual norms

$$\frac{\|b - Ax_n\|_2}{\|b - Ax_0\|_2} \tag{9}$$

for the symmetric QMR Algorithm 1 (solid line) and MINRES [13] (dotted line). Re-

Figure 1: *Convergence curves for Stokes example*

call that MINRES requires a positive definite preconditioner, and we used the diagonal matrix $|M|$ consisting of the absolute values of the diagonal elements of A as the preconditioner. Notice that QMR converges almost twice as fast as MINRES. We stress that both algorithms have essentially the same work and storage requirements.

The second example is a linear system (1) with a nonsingular symmetric indefinite coefficient matrix A of the form (3) (with the lower right block D being the zero matrix). This system arose in connection with the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker optimality conditions for an optimization problem, and we will refer to it as a KKT system. The order of A is $N = 1000$, and the upper left block B in (3) is a positive definite 600×600 matrix. The matrix A is highly indefinite with 600 positive and 400 negative eigenvalues. For this system we obtained a symmetric indefinite preconditioner by computing a Bunch-Parlett factorization [1] of the form

$$M = LDL^T \quad (10)$$

of an approximation M to A . Here L is a unit lower triangular matrix and D is a nonsingular block diagonal matrix with 1×1 and 2×2 blocks. We ran the symmetric QMR Algorithm 1 with right preconditioner M , and we compared it to MINRES with a positive definite right preconditioner $\hat{M}$. Following a proposal made in [9], we used the positive definite matrix $\hat{M} = L\hat{D}L^T$ that is obtained from (10) by constructing a block diagonal matrix $\hat{D}$ whose eigenvalues are just the absolute values of those of the indefinite matrix D . The resulting relative residual norms (9) for symmetric QMR (solid line) and MINRES (dotted line) are shown in Figure 2. In this example, symmetric QMR converges

Figure 2: Convergence curves for KKT system

more than twice as fast as MINRES.

If no preconditioning is used, then the symmetric QMR algorithm 1 and MINRES are mathematically equivalent. In Figure 2, we also plotted the residual norm (9) for a run of Algorithm 1 without preconditioning (dashed line). Note that the method does not converge in a reasonable number of iterations. We remark that all Krylov-subspace iterations typically converge very slowly for highly indefinite coefficient matrices.

Finally, we refer the reader to [4] for further results of numerical experiments with linear systems from optimization problems. In [4], Freund and Jarre use the symmetric QMR Algorithm 1 to solve the symmetric indefinite linear systems that arise in each iteration of a primal-dual interior-point method for linear programs.

6. References

- [1] J.R. Bunch and B.N. Parlett, "Direct methods for solving symmetric indefinite systems of linear equations", SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 8, pp. 639-655, 1971.
- [2] R.W. Freund, "Transpose-free quasi-minimal residual methods for non-Hermitian linear systems", Recent Advances in Iterative Methods (G. Golub, A. Greenbaum, and M. Luskin, eds.), The IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications, Vol. 60, pp. 69-94, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.

- [3] R.W. Freund, M.H. Gutknecht, and N.M. Nachtigal, "An implementation of the look-ahead Lanczos algorithm for non-Hermitian matrices", *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 14, pp. 137-158, 1993.
- [4] R.W. Freund and F. Jarre, "An interior-point method for large linear programs based on the symmetric QMR algorithm", in preparation.
- [5] R.W. Freund and N.M. Nachtigal, "QMR: a quasi-minimal residual method for non-Hermitian linear systems", *Numer. Math.* 60, pp. 315-339, 1991.
- [6] R.W. Freund and N.M. Nachtigal, "An implementation of the QMR method based on coupled two-term recurrences", *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 15, pp. 313-337, 1994.
- [7] R.W. Freund and T. Szeto, "A transpose-free quasi-minimal residual squared algorithm for non-Hermitian linear systems", *Advances in Computer Methods for Partial Differential Equations - VII* (R. Vichnevetsky, D. Knight, and G. Richter, eds.), pp. 258-264, IMACS, 1992.
- [8] R.W. Freund and H. Zha, "Simplifications of the nonsymmetric Lanczos process and a new algorithm for Hermitian indefinite linear systems", *AT&T Numerical Analysis Manuscript*, Bell Labs, Murray Hill, NJ, 1994.
- [9] P.E. Gill, W. Murray, D.B. Ponceleón, and M.A. Saunders, "Preconditioners for indefinite systems arising in optimization", *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* 13, pp. 292-311, 1992.
- [10] M.D. Gunzburger, *Finite Element Methods for Viscous Incompressible Flows*, Academic Press, San Diego, 1989.
- [11] C. Lanczos, "An iteration method for the solution of the eigenvalue problem of linear differential and integral operators", *J. Res. Nat. Bur. Standards* 45, pp. 255-282, 1950.
- [12] C. Lanczos, "Solution of systems of linear equations by minimized iterations", *J. Res. Nat. Bur. Standards* 49, pp. 33-53, 1952.
- [13] C.C. Paige and M.A. Saunders, "Solution of sparse indefinite systems of linear equations", *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 12, pp. 617-629, 1975.
- [14] D.J. Silvester and K. Kechkar, "Stabilised bilinear-constant velocity-pressure finite elements for the conjugate gradient solution of the Stokes problem", *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.* 79, pp. 71-86, 1990.

ORNL/TM-12754

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

1. B.R. Appleton	22. C.H. Romine
2-3. T.S. Darland	23. T.H. Rowan
4. E.F. D'Azevedo	24. B.D. Semeraro
5. J.M. Donato	25. W.A. Shelton
6. J.J. Dongarra	26-30. R.F. Sincovec
7. G.A. Geist	31-35. R.C. Ward
8. S.L. Lee	36. Central Research Library
9. M.R. Leuze	37. ORNL Patent Office
10-14. E.G. Ng	38. K-25 Appl Tech Library
15. C.E. Oliver	39. Y-12 Technical Library
16. P.M. Papadopoulos	40. Lab Records Dept - RC
17-21. S.A. Raby	41-42. Laboratory Records Dept

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

43. Loyce Adams, Dept. of Applied Mathematics, FS-20, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195
44. Greg Ammar, Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL 60115
45. Steven Ashby, Lawrence Livermore National Lab, P.O. Box 808, M/S L-316, Livermore, CA 94551-0808
46. Donald M. Austin, 6196 EECS Bldg., University of Minnesota, 200 Union St., S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455
47. Owe Axelsson, Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics, University of Nijmegen, NL-6525 ED Nijmegen The Netherlands
48. Jesse Barlow, Dept. of Computer Science and Engineering, Pennsylvania State University, 220 Pond Laboratory, University Park, PA 16802-6106
49. Edward H. Barsis, Sandia National Laboratories, Computer Science and Mathematics, P.O. Box 5800, Albuquerque, NM 87185
50. Ake Bjorck, Dept. of Mathematics, Linkoping University, S-58183 Linkoping, Sweden
51. Petter Bjorstad, Institutt for Informatikk, Hoyteknologisenteret, N-5020 Bergen, Norway
52. Roger W. Brockett, Harvard University, 29 Oxford Street, Cambridge, MA 02138-2901
53. Richard Brualdi, Dept. of Mathematics, 480 Lincoln Drive, Madison, WI 53706
54. Angelika Bunse-Gerstner, Fachbereich Mathematik und Informatik, Universität Bremen, Postfach 33 04 40, D-28334 Bremen, Federal Republic of Germany

55. Daniela Calvetti, Stevens Institute of Technology, Dept. of Mathematics, Hoboken, NJ 07030
56. Ian Cavers, Dept. of Computer Science, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia V6T 1W5, Canada
57. Tony Chan, Dept. of Mathematics, University of California, Los Angeles, 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1555
58. Paul Concus, Mathematics and Computing, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, 50A/2129, Berkeley, CA 94720
59. Jane Cullum, IBM T.J. Watson Research Center, P.O. Box 218, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598
60. Biswa Datta, Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL 60115
61. James Demmel, Dept. of Computer Science, University of California, 571 Evans Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720
62. John Dorning, Dept. of Nuclear Engineering Physics, Nuclear Reactor Facility, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22903-2442
63. Donald J. Dudziak, Dept. of Nuclear Engineering, 110B Burlington Engineering Labs, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695-7909
64. Michael Eiermann, Institut für Angewandte Mathematik II, TU Bergakademie Freiberg, D-09596 Freiberg, Federal Republic of Germany
65. Howard Elman, Dept. of Computer Science, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742
66. Robert Ferraro, Jet Propulsion Lab, M/S 198-136A, 4800 Oak Grove Drive, Pasadena, CA 91109
67. Bernd Fischer, Universität Hamburg, Institut für Angewandte Mathematik, Bunderstrasse 55, D-2000 Hamburg 13, Federal Republic of Germany
68. Geoffrey C. Fox, Northeast Parallel Architectures Center, 111 College Place, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244-4100
69. Efstratios Gallopoulos, CSRD, 465 C & SRI, University of Illinois, 1308 W Main Street, Urbana, IL 61801-2983
70. J. Alan George, Vice President, Academic and Provost, Needles Hall, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1
71. Gene H. Golub, Dept. of Computer Science, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305
72. William Gragg, Dept. of Mathematics, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93943-5100
73. Joe Grcar, Sandia National Laboratories, Division 8245, Livermore, CA 94551-0969
74. Anne Greenbaum, Courant Institute, New York University, 251 Mercer Street, New York, NY 10012-1185
75. John Gustafson, Ames Laboratory, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011
76. Martin Gutknecht, IPS Supercomputing, ETH-Zentrum, CH-8092 Zurich, Switzerland

77. Christian Halloy, Assistant Director of JICS, 104 South College, Joint Institute for Computational Science, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-1301
78. Martin Hanke, Universität Karlsruhe, Institut für Praktische Mathematik, Englerstrasse 2, D-76128 Karlsruhe, Federal Republic of Germany
79. Michael Heroux, Cray Research Inc, 655F Lone Oak Dr, Eagan, MN 55121-1560
80. Nicholas Higham, Dept. of Mathematics, University of Manchester, Gt Manchester, M13 9PL, England
81. Marlis Hochbruck, Mathematisches Institut, Universität Tuebingen, Auf der Morgenstelle 10, D-72076 Tuebingen, Federal Republic of Germany
82. Louis Howell, Lawrence Livermore National Lab, P.O. Box 808, M/S L-316, Livermore, CA 94550-0808
83. Ilse Ipsen, Dept. of Mathematics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695-8205
84. Wayne Joubert, Los Alamos National Lab, Group C3, M/S B-265, Los Alamos, NM 87545
85. Malvyn H. Kalos, Cornell Theory Center, Engineering and Theory Center Bldg., Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853-3901
86. Hans Kaper, Mathematics and Computer Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 South Cass Avenue, Bldg. 221, Argonne, IL 60439
87. Herbert Keller, Dept. of Applied Mathematics, 217-50, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125
88. Kenneth Kennedy, Dept. of Computer Science, Rice University, P.O. Box 1892, Houston, TX 77001
89. David Keyes, NASA Langley Research Center, ICASE, M/S L23C, Hampton, CA 23681-0001
90. Frank Korsmeyer, Dept. of Ocean Engineering, 5-326, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139
91. Richard Lehoucq, Dept. of Computational and Applied Mathematics, P.O. Box 1892, Rice University, Houston, TX 77251-1892
92. James E. Leiss, Rt. 2, Box 142C, Broadway, VA 22815
93. John G. Lewis, Boeing Computer Services, P.O. Box 24346, M/S 7L-21, Seattle, WA 98124-0346
94. Eric Lucas, 8787 Manahan Drive, Ellicott City, MD 21043
95. Thomas A. Manteuffel, Program in Applied Mathematics, Campus Box 526, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309-0526
96. Kapil Mathur, Thinking Machines Corporation, 245 First Street, Cambridge, MA 02142
97. James McGraw, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, P.O. Box 808, M/S L-306 Livermore, CA 94550
98. Cleve Moler, The Mathworks, 24 Prime Park Way, Natick, MA 01760

99. Neville Moray, Dept. of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, University of Illinois, 1206 West Green Street, Urbana, IL 61801
100. David Nelson, Director of Scientific Computing, ER-7, Applied Mathematical Sciences, Office of Energy Research, U.S. Dept. of Energy, Washington, DC 20585
101. Wilhelm Niethammer, Universität Karlsruhe, Institut für Praktische Mathematik, Englerstrasse 2, D-76128 Karlsruhe, Federal Republic of Germany
102. Dianne P. O'Leary, Dept. of Computer Science, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742
103. James M. Ortega, Dept. of Applied Mathematics, Thornton Hall, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22901
104. Elizabeth Ong, Dept. of Mathematics, 9500 Gilman Drive, University of California, La Jolla, CA 92093-0112
105. Michael Overton, Courant Institute, New York University, 251 Mercer Street, New York, NY 10012-1185
106. Beresford N. Parlett, Dept. of Mathematics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720
107. Alexander Peters, IBM Corporation, Heidelberg Scientific Center, Vangerowstrasse 18, D-69020 Heidelberg, Federal Republic of Germany
108. Linda Petzold, Dept. of Computer Science, University of Minnesota, 4-192 EE/CS Bldg, 200 Union Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0159
109. Robert J. Plemmons, Dept.s of Mathematics and Computer Science, Box 7311, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC 27109
110. Jame. C. T. Pool, Deputy Director, Caltech Concurrent Supercomputing Facility, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125
111. Jesse Poore, Dept. of Computer Science, Ayres Hall, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-1301
112. Lothar Reichel, Dept. of Mathematics, Kent State University, Kent, OH 44242
113. Werner C. Rheinboldt, Dept. of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260
114. Youcef Saad, Dept. of Computer Science, University of Minnesota, 4-192 EE/CS Bldg, 200 Union Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0159
115. Ahmed H. Sameh, Dept. of Computer Science, University of Minnesota, 4-192 EE/CS Bldg, 200 Union Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455-0159
116. Michael Saunders, Systems Optimization Laboratory, Operations Research Dept., Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305
117. Robert Schreiber, RIACS, Mail Stop 230-5, NASA Ames Research Center, Moffet Field, CA 94035
118. David S. Scott, Intel Scientific Computers, 15201 N.W. Greenbrier Parkway, Beaverton, OR 97006
119. Valeria Simoncini, Via Pacinotti 10, 40024 Castel S Pietro, Bologna, Italy

120. Horst Simon, Mail Stop T045-1, NASA Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA 94035
121. Danny Sorensen, Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, Rice University, P.O. Box 1892, Houston, TX 77251
122. Gerhard Starke, Universität Karlsruhe, Institut für Praktische Mathematik, Englerstrasse 2, D-76128 Karlsruhe, Federal Republic of Germany
123. Zdenek Strakos, Czech Academy of Sciences, Pod vod.vezi 2, 182 08 Praha 8, Czech Republic
124. Paul N. Swartztrauber, National Center for Atmospheric Research, P.O. Box 3000, Boulder, CO 80307
125. Daniel Szyld, Dept. of Mathematics, Temple University, TU038-16, Philadelphia, PA 19122-2585
126. Wei Pai Tang, Dept. of Computer Science, University of Waterloo, Waterloo N2L 3G1, Ontario, Canada
127. Nick Trefethen, Dept. of Computer Science, Cornell University, Upson Hall, Ithaca, NY 14853
128. Raymond S. Tuminaro, Sandia National Laboratories, Mail Stop 1110, P.O. Box 5800, Albuquerque, NM 87185
129. Hank Van der Vorst, Dept. of Techn. Mathematics and Computer Science, Delft University of Technology, P.O. Box 356, NL-2600 AJ Delft, The Netherlands
130. Paul Van Dooren, Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Illinois, 1101 W. Springfield Avenue, Urbana, IL 61801
131. Charles Van Loan, Dept. of Computer Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853
132. Jim Varah, Centre for Integrated Computer Systems Research, University of British Columbia, Office 2053-2324 Main Mall, Vancouver, British Columbia V6T 1W5, Canada
133. Madan Verma, Dept. of Electrical Engineering, 3480 University Street, McGill University, Montreal H3A 2A7, Quebec, Canada
134. Phuong Vu, Cray Research, Inc., 19607 Franz Road, Houston, TX 77084
135. Mary F. Wheeler, Rice University, Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, P.O. Box 1892, Houston, TX 77251
136. Andrew B. White, Computing Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, P.O. Box 1663, MS-265, Los Alamos, NM 87545
137. Jacob White, Dept. of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Room 36-880, 50 Vassar Street, Cambridge, MA 02139-4309
138. David Young, Boeing Computer Services, M/S 7L-21, P.O. Box 24346, Seattle, WA 98124-0346
139. David Young, University of Texas, Center for Numerical Analysis, RLM 13.150, Austin, TX 78731-8510
140. Office of Assistant Manager for Energy Research and Development, U.S. Dept. of Energy, Oak Ridge Operations Office, P.O. Box 2001 Oak Ridge, TN 37831-8600
- 141-142. Office of Scientific & Technical Information, P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, TN 37831