

Research Report

KSTS/RR-15/008

September 29, 2015

**The GKB-GCV method for solving the general form
of the Tikhonov regularization**

by

**Dai Togashi
Takashi Nodera**

Dai Togashi
School of Fundamental Science and Technology
Keio University

Takashi Nodera
Department of Mathematics
Keio University

Department of Mathematics
Faculty of Science and Technology
Keio University

©2015 KSTS

3-14-1 Hiyoshi, Kohoku-ku, Yokohama, 223-8522 Japan

The GKB-GCV Method for Solving the General form of the Tikhonov Regularization

Dai Togashi ^{*} Takashi Nodera [†]

Abstract

The W-GCV method is one of the iterative methods used to solve a large scale standard form of the Tikhonov regularization, but it is also necessary for solving the general form of the Tikhonov regularization. This paper proposes a new solver, called GKB-GCV, which is an extension of the W-GCV by using the GSVD. Numerical results are presented to show the usefulness of the GKB-GCV method in large scale ill-posed problems.

Keywords: GKB, W-GCV, Tikhonov regularization, large scale ill-posed problem, Image resolution.

1 Introduction

The stable approximate solution for a large scale ill-posed problem of the form:

$$\mathbf{x}_{LS} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|\mathbf{b} - A\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \quad (1)$$

is computed, where matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $m \geq n$, is ill-conditioned. The right-hand vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ contains the following error:

$$\mathbf{b} = A\mathbf{x}_{\text{exact}} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \quad (2)$$

where $x_{\text{exact}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the exact solution, and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the unknown noise. A matrix of this form sometimes comes from image resolutions. Because matrix A is ill-conditioned, \mathbf{x}_{LS} is dependent on noise. The Tikhonov regularization [11] constructs stable approximations of x_{exact} by solving the least squares problem of the form:

$$\mathbf{x}_\lambda = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\|\mathbf{b} - A\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 + \lambda^2 \|L\mathbf{x}\|_2^2\}, \quad (3)$$

where $L \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ is the regularization matrix, and $\lambda > 0$ is the regularization parameter. The standard form of the Tikhonov regularization is when $L = I_n$, where I_n is the $n \times n$ identity matrix. The general form of the Tikhonov regularization is when $L \neq I_n$. When

^{*}School of Fundamental Science and Technology, Graduate School of Science and Technology, Keio University, JAPAN. Email: dai-togashi@keio.jp

[†]Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science and Technology, Keio University, JAPAN. Email: nodera@math.keio.ac.jp

the common space between the null spaces of A and L is the zero space, the regularization problem (3) has a unique solution. To obtain a good approximate solution for (3), an appropriate regularization parameter is required. There are many methods for determining the regularization parameter without knowledge of the noise's norm $\|\epsilon\|_2$, [1, 6, 5].

Solving equation (3) and all the approach selecting parameters of the above is computable when the GSVD for the pair of matrix (A, L) has been computed. One problem is that the GSVD is not cost effective when the A or the L is a large scale matrix. For a large scale problem, iterative methods are used, e.g. the LSQR, the CGLS, or some kind of Krylov subspace method. Computing good approximate solutions by using iterative methods, require the parameter λ a priori and a suitable stopping criteria. The hybrid method solves this issue through combining the projection method with an inner regularization method. For $L = I_n$, there are two hybrid methods, called GKB-FP [2] and W-GCV [4]. These methods do not require identifying the norm $\|\epsilon\|_2$, and contain a projection over the Krylov subspace generated by the Golub-Kahan Bidiagonalization (GKB) method. The difference between these two methods is in the approach in terms of determining the regularization parameter. The GKB-FP uses the FP scheme, whereas the W-GCV uses the weighed GCV.

Lampe et al. [8] and Reichel et al. [10] have proposed approaches for $L \neq I_n$ by minimizing the regularization problem over the generalized Krylov subspace. These approaches determine the regularization parameter by using the knowledge of the norm $\|\epsilon\|_2$. Bazán et al. [3] proposed an approach without identifying the norm ϵ , which is created by the extension of the GKB-FP method.

This paper focuses on the W-GCV method which is a solver for a large scale standard form of the Tikhonov regularization which does not require identifying the norm of the noise. This paper proposes applying an extension of the W-GCV to the general form of the Tikhonov regularization. The approach of the W-GCV is based on the idea of the GKB-FP and the idea of the AT-GCV [9]. The stopping criteria of the W-GCV and the AT-GCV are also compared.

This paper is organized as follows: After the introduction, Section 2 summarizes the framework of the classical W-GCV method. In Section 3, the extensions of the W-GCV to the general form of the Tikhonov regularization, are described briefly. Following this, a new scheme of GKB-GCV is proposed. In section 4, the usefulness of the GKB-GCV for test problems, is illustrated. The conclusions and possible future studies are explored in Section 5.

2 The W-GCV method

The W-GCV is one of the algorithms for the standard form of the Tikhonov regularization, which is based on the GKB and weighted GCV. For the standard form, i.e. $L = I_n$, the SVD of matrix A reduces the solution for equation (3) as follows:

$$\mathbf{x}_\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\sigma_i \mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{b}}{\sigma_i^2 + \lambda^2} \mathbf{v}_i \quad \text{with} \quad A = U \Sigma V^T$$

where each $U = [\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m]$, $V = [\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n]$ has left and right singular vectors of A , and Σ is the singular value of matrix A diagonal with $\sigma_1 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_n \geq 0$, and 0 on the non-diagonal. When we apply $k < n$ GKB steps to matrix A with the initial vector $\mathbf{b}/\|\mathbf{b}\|_2$,

it results in two matrices $Y_{k+1} = [\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{k+1}] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (k+1)}$, and $W_k = [\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_k] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ with orthonormal columns, and a lower bidiagonal matrix as follows.

$$B_k = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & & & & \\ \beta_2 & \alpha_2 & & & \\ & \beta_3 & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & \alpha_k & \\ & & & \beta_{k+1} & \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(k+1) \times k},$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1 Y_{k+1} \mathbf{e}_1 &= \mathbf{b} = \beta_1 \mathbf{y}_1, \\ AW_k &= Y_{k+1} B_k, \\ A^T Y_{k+1} &= W_k B_k^T + \alpha_{k+1} \mathbf{w}_{k+1} \mathbf{e}_{k+1}^T, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{e}_i denotes the i -th unit vector in \mathbb{R}^{k+1} . Furthermore, columns of W_k are the orthonormal basis for the generalized Krylov subspace $\mathcal{K}_k(A^T A, A^T \mathbf{b})$. The standard form of regularization, i.e. $L = I_n$, over the generated Krylov subspace is as follows:

$$\mathbf{x}_\lambda^{(k)} = \underset{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}_k(A^T A, A^T \mathbf{b})}{\operatorname{argmin}} \{ \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{b}\|_2^2 + \lambda^2 \|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \}. \quad (4)$$

Since the columns of W_k are the orthonormal basis for the generated Krylov subspace, equation (4) is reduced as follows:

$$\mathbf{x}_\lambda^{(k)} = W_k \mathbf{y}_\lambda^{(k)}, \quad \mathbf{y}_\lambda^{(k)} = \underset{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^k}{\operatorname{argmin}} \{ \|B_k \mathbf{y} - \beta_1 \mathbf{e}_1\|_2^2 + \lambda^2 \|\mathbf{y}\|_2^2 \}. \quad (5)$$

This reduction technique is a good choice for large scale problems, because this approach reduces the size of the least squares problem: $(m+p) \times n$ to $(2k+1) \times k$.

The GCV and weighted GCV methods determine the regularization parameter. The GCV determines the regularization parameter by searching for the minimum point of function as follows:

$$G_{A, \mathbf{b}, I_n}(\lambda) = \frac{\|(I_m - AA_{\lambda, I}^+) \mathbf{b}\|_2^2}{(\operatorname{trace}(I_m - AA_{\lambda, I_n}^+))^2}, \quad (6)$$

where $A_{\lambda, L}^+ = (A^T A + \lambda^2 L^T L)^{-1} A^T$. Using the SVD for matrix A , equation (6) is written as follows:

$$G_{A, \mathbf{b}, I_n}(\lambda) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\lambda^2 \mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{b}}{\sigma_i^2 + \lambda^2} \right)^2 + \sum_{i=n+1}^m (\mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{b})^2}{\left(m - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\sigma_i^2 + \lambda^2} \right)^2}. \quad (7)$$

The approach of the GCV to the least squares problem is as follows:

$$G_{B_k, \beta_1 \mathbf{e}_1, I_k}(\lambda) = \frac{\|(I_m - B_k (B_k)_{\lambda, I}^+) \beta_1 \mathbf{e}_1\|_2^2}{(\operatorname{trace}(I_{k+1} - B_k (B_k)_{\lambda, I_k}^+))^2}. \quad (8)$$

However, the optimal parameter determined by equation (8) is unsuitable for equation (3). Therefore, the weighted GCV for a reduced system of equation (5) is used instead:

$$G_{B_k, \beta_1 \mathbf{e}_1, I_k}^{(\omega)}(\lambda) = \frac{\|(I_m - B_k (B_k)_{\lambda, I}^+) \beta_1 \mathbf{e}_1\|_2^2}{(\operatorname{trace}(I_{k+1} - \omega B_k (B_k)_{\lambda, I_k}^+))^2}. \quad (9)$$

Algorithm 1 W-GCV

Require: $A, \mathbf{b}, \omega > 0, tol$

Ensure: Regularized solution $\mathbf{x}_{\lambda^*}^{(k)}$

1. Apply GKB step to A with starting vector \mathbf{b} at $k = 0$ and set $k = 1$.
 2. Perform one more GKB step.
 3. Compute $\text{SVD}(B_k)$. $B_k = U_k \Sigma_k V_k^T$.
 4. Compute λ_k by weighted GCV.
 5. **If** stopping criteria is satisfied **do**
 $\lambda^* = \lambda_k$.
else do
 $k \leftarrow k + 1$
Update the weighted parameter ω
Go to step 2.
end if
 6. Solve subproblem $\mathbf{y}_{\lambda^*}^{(k)}$.
 7. Compute the regularized solution $\mathbf{x}_{\lambda^*}^{(k)}$.
-

When $\omega = 1$, the weighted GCV is the same as the standard GCV method. Furthermore, the approximate solution becomes smooth at $\omega > 1$, and less smooth at $\omega < 1$. Similarly, the SVD for matrix B_k reduces equation (9) as follows:

$$G_{B_k, \beta_1 \mathbf{e}_1, I_k}^{(\omega)}(\lambda) = \frac{\beta_1^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{\lambda^2 \mathbf{u}_{i(k)}^T \mathbf{e}_1}{\sigma_{i(k)}^2 + \lambda^2} \right)^2 + (\mathbf{u}_{k+1(k)}^T \mathbf{e}_1)^2 \right)}{\left(k + 1 - \omega \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\sigma_{i(k)}^2}{\sigma_{i(k)}^2 + \lambda^2} \right)^2}. \quad (10)$$

where $B_k = U_k \Sigma_k V_k^T$. The SVD for B_k can be computed easily, because the size of B_k is $(k+1) \times k$, and smaller than the size of matrix A . The stopping criterion is as follows:

$$\frac{|\hat{G}(k+1) - \hat{G}(k)|}{|\hat{G}(1)|} < tol \quad (11)$$

where $\hat{G}(k)$ is an approximation for $G_{A, \mathbf{b}, I_n}(\lambda)$ without a weighted parameter, and tol is the stopping tolerance.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{G}(k) &= \frac{\|(I_m - A(B_k)_{\lambda, I}^+ \bar{U}_{k+1}^T) \mathbf{b}\|_2^2}{(\text{trace}(I_m - A(B_k)_{\lambda, I}^+ \bar{U}_{k+1}^T))^2}, \\ &= \frac{\beta_1^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{\lambda_k^2 \mathbf{u}_{i(k)}^T \mathbf{e}_1}{\sigma_{i(k)}^2 + \lambda_k^2} \right)^2 + (\mathbf{u}_{k+1(k)}^T \mathbf{e}_1)^2 \right)}{\left(m - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\sigma_{i(k)}^2}{\sigma_{i(k)}^2 + \lambda_k^2} \right)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The W-GCV method is summarized in Algorithm 1.

3 GKB-GCV method

The purpose of this section is to identify a working extension of the W-GCV that can be used with a general form of the Tikhonov regularization. The extension that is proposed will be referred to as the GKB-GCV. In its general form, i.e. $L \neq I_n$, equation (3) is reduced by the GKB as follows:

$$\mathbf{x}_\lambda^{(k)} = W_k \mathbf{y}_\lambda^{(k)}, \quad \mathbf{y}_\lambda^{(k)} = \underset{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^k}{\operatorname{argmin}} \{ \|B_k \mathbf{y} - \beta_1 \mathbf{e}_1\|_2^2 + \lambda^2 \|LW_k \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 \}. \quad (12)$$

In equation (12), the size of the least squares problem is $(k + 1 + p) \times k$.

The same reduction to PROJ-L when solving the general form of the Tikhonov regularization of Bazán [3] is used as follows:

$$\mathbf{y}_\lambda^{(k)} = \underset{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^k}{\operatorname{argmin}} \{ \|B_k \mathbf{y} - \beta_1 \mathbf{e}_1\|_2^2 + \lambda \|R_k \mathbf{y}\|_2^2 \}, \quad (13)$$

where $LW_k = Q_k R_k$, using the QR factorization. For increasing k , the QR factorization can be updated computing $k + 1$ elements by using the summation and a product of the vectors. This approach can be used without limitation of dimension for L , i.e. for any number of p , unlike the AT-GCV method which is one of the hybrid methods using the same GCV. The next step was to consider change points in the GCV. One problem is that when $L \neq I_n$, the SVD for matrix A can not reduce the number of the residual norm and trace into the GCV function to form at equation (7) and (10). This problem was addressed by using the GSVD for the pair of matrix (A, L) , $A = USZ^{-1}$ and $L = VCZ^{-1}$, where $U = [\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m]$, $V = [\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_p]$ are orthogonal, Z is nonsingular matrix, and each S, C have $s_1 \geq \dots \geq s_n \geq 0$ and $0 \leq c_1 \leq \dots \leq c_n$ on its diagonals and 0 on its nondiagonals. GSVD for the pair of matrix (A, L) reduces the GCV function as follows:

$$G_{A,\mathbf{b},L}(\lambda) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{c_i^2 \lambda^2 \mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{b}}{s_i^2 + c_i^2 \lambda^2} \right)^2 + \sum_{i=n+1}^m (\mathbf{u}_i^T \mathbf{b})^2}{\left(m - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{s_i^2}{s_i^2 + c_i^2 \lambda^2} \right)^2}. \quad (14)$$

Using a similar computation of $G_{B_k, \beta_1 \mathbf{e}_1, R_k}^{(\omega)}(\lambda)$, the equation (14) was reduced as follows by using GSVD(B_k, R_k):

$$G_{B_k, \beta_1 \mathbf{e}_1, R_k}^{(\omega)}(\lambda) = \frac{\beta_1^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{c_{i(k)}^2 \lambda^2 \mathbf{u}_{i(k)}^T \mathbf{e}_1}{s_{i(k)}^2 + c_{i(k)}^2 \lambda^2} \right)^2 + (\mathbf{u}_{k+1(k)}^T \mathbf{e}_1)^2 \right)}{\left(k + 1 - \omega \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{s_{i(k)}^2}{s_{i(k)}^2 + c_{i(k)}^2 \lambda^2} \right)^2}.$$

where $B_k = U_k S_k Z_k^{-1}$, $R_k = V_k C_k Z_k^{-1}$. However, the determination of weight parameter ω is difficult. The AT-GCV method applies a similar function to $\hat{G}(k)$ for the GCV function at step k [9]:

$$\begin{aligned} G_k(\lambda) &= \frac{\|(I_m - A(B_k)_{\lambda, R_k}^+ \bar{U}_{k+1}^T) \mathbf{b}\|_2^2}{(\operatorname{trace}(I_m - A(B_k)_{\lambda, R_k}^+ \bar{U}_{k+1}^T))^2}, \\ &= \frac{\beta_1^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{\lambda_k^2 \mathbf{u}_{i(k)}^T \mathbf{e}_1}{\sigma_{i(k)}^2 + \lambda_k^2} \right)^2 + (\mathbf{u}_{k+1(k)}^T \mathbf{e}_1)^2 \right)}{\left(m - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\sigma_{i(k)}^2}{\sigma_{i(k)}^2 + \lambda_k^2} \right)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Algorithm 2 GKB-GCV

Require: A, \mathbf{b}, L, tol

Ensure: Regularized solution $\mathbf{x}_{\lambda^*}^{(k)}$

1. Apply GKB step to A with starting vector \mathbf{b} at $k = 0$ and set $k = 1$.
 2. Perform one more GKB step and update QR factorization of LW_k .
 $LW_k = Q_k R_k$.
 3. Compute GSVD(B_k, R_k). $B_k = U_k S_k Z^{-1}$, $R_k = V_k C_k Z^{-1}$.
 4. Compute minimized point λ_k of $G_k(\lambda)$.
 5. **If** stopping criteria is satisfied **do**
 $\lambda^* = \lambda_k$.
else do
 $k \leftarrow k + 1$
Go to step 2.
end if
 6. Solve subproblem $\mathbf{y}_{\lambda^*}^{(k)}$.
 7. Compute the regularized solution $\mathbf{x}_{\lambda^*}^{(k)} = W_k \mathbf{y}_{\lambda^*}^{(k)}$.
-

This approach does not need to determine weight parameter ω . These two functions have different purposes. The GCV function in W-GCV determines the appropriate regularization parameter for the reduced equation (13), and the GCV function at AT-GCV approximates the appropriate regularization parameter for the original equation (3). Furthermore, the AT-GCV uses the residual norm entered when computing the GCV function for the stopping rule which is different from the W-GCV:

$$\frac{(|\|\mathbf{r}_{\lambda_k}^{(k)}\|_2 - \|\mathbf{r}_{\lambda_{k-1}}^{(k-1)}\|_2|)}{\|\mathbf{r}_{\lambda_k}^{(k)}\|_2} < \sqrt{tol}, \quad (15)$$

where $\mathbf{r}_{\lambda_k}^{(k)} = B_k \mathbf{y}_{\lambda_k}^{(k)} - \beta_1 \mathbf{e}_1$. Numerical experiments were used to illustrate the differences between these stopping rules. The stopping rule for equation (11) to the GKB-GCV(\hat{G}) and the rule of equation (15) to GKB-GCV($r^{(k)}$) were noted. The stopping rule for GKB-GCV($r^{(k)}$) was too severe compared to the stopping rule for GKB-GCV(W). Hence, to create tolerance with regards to the stopping rule, \sqrt{tol} on GKB-GCV($r^{(k)}$) was used. In addition, another stopping rule was used:

$$\frac{(|\|\mathbf{r}_{\lambda_k}^{(k)}\|_2 - \|\mathbf{r}_{\lambda_{k-1}}^{(k-1)}\|_2|)}{\|\mathbf{r}_{\lambda_1}^{(1)}\|_2} < tol. \quad (16)$$

The GKB-GCV was compactly summarized in Algorithm 2.

4 Numerical experiments

The PROJ-L method which is also one of the hybrid methods and an extension of GKB-FP, was used for the purpose of comparison with the proposed method in this paper. The 2D image deblurring problem which is the procedure for recovering original images from blurred images using noise from the form equation (2) was considered. Matrix A was the

	PROJ-L($p_0 = 10$)	GKB-GCV(\hat{G})	GKB-GCV($r^{(k)}$)	GKB-GCV($r^{(1)}$)
NL = 10^{-2}				
$\bar{\lambda}$	0.0819	6.82×10^{-3}	5.57×10^{-3}	3.25×10^{-3}
\bar{E}	0.0821	0.0899	0.0848	0.0806
\bar{t} (sec)	0.416	0.150	0.206	0.399
$k_m(k_M)$	27(32)	11(11)	15(15)	27(27)
NL = 10^{-3}				
$\bar{\lambda}$	7.11×10^{-3}	3.22×10^{-3}	4.90×10^{-4}	5.43×10^{-4}
\bar{E}	0.0651	0.0891	0.0681	0.0693
\bar{t} (sec)	1.45	0.150	0.728	0.592
$k_m(k_M)$	94(102)	11(11)	47(48)	41(41)
NL = 10^{-4}				
$\bar{\lambda}$	1.16×10^{-3}	3.15×10^{-3}	1.41×10^{-4}	2.24×10^{-4}
\bar{E}	0.0624	0.0891	0.0645	0.0675
\bar{t} (sec)	2.03	0.150	1.41	0.734
$k_m(k_M)$	124(138)	11(11)	82(88)	49(53)

Table 1: Results for the test problem *rice64* with $tol = 10^{-4}$

blurring operator, e.g. the Point Spread Function(PSF) matrix, and $\mathbf{b}_{\text{exact}} = A\mathbf{x}_{\text{exact}}$ are blurred images without any noise. All computations of numerical experiments were carried out in MATLAB R2013b, and generated noise vectors $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ by the MATLAB code `randn` and $NL = \|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}\|_2 / \|\mathbf{b}_{\text{exact}}\|_2$. $N \times N$ images with $N^2 \times N^2$ Gaussian PSF matrices as a blurring operator were used. The Gaussian PSF was defined by $A = (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-1}T \otimes T$, where σ was the parameter used to control the width of the Gaussian PSF, and T was an $N \times N$ symmetric banded toeplitz matrix with generators of the form:

$$\mathbf{z} = [\exp(-([0:\text{band}-1].^2)/(2*\sigma^2)); \text{zeros}(1, N-\text{band})]$$

from Kilmore et al. [7]. In our tests, we used $\sigma = 2$ and `band` = 16. A regularization matrix lowering the gap between adjacent points was chosen:

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} I_N \otimes L_1 \\ L_1 \otimes I_N \end{bmatrix}, \quad L_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & & & \\ & 1 & -1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-1) \times N}.$$

4.1 Test problem 1: *rice64*

The interpolation data of MATLAB, *rice* image were used in test problem 1. Firstly, a 64×64 sub-image of *rice* and *rice64* were used to compare noise levels. $A \in \mathbb{R}^{4096 \times 4096}$ and $L \in \mathbb{R}^{8064 \times 4096}$, and the condition number was $\text{cond}(A) \approx 2.14 \times 10^{16}$. These experiments used ten noise vectors for each noise level: $NL = 10^{-2}, 10^{-3}$ and 10^{-4} . To simplify the notation, $\bar{\lambda}, \bar{t}$ and \bar{E} denoted the average value of the regularization parameter, time and relative error, and $k_m(k_M)$ denoted the minimum (maximum) number of steps required. The computation of the FP method on PROJ-L started with $p_0 = 10$ and $\mu = 1$. The stopping criteria was set to $tol = 10^{-4}$.

	PROJ-L($p_0 = 15$)	GKB-GCV(\hat{G})	GKB-GCV($r^{(k)}$)	GKB-GCV($r^{(1)}$)
NL = 10^{-2}				
$\bar{\lambda}$	0.0874	1.22×10^{-3}	9.54×10^{-4}	5.37×10^{-4}
\bar{E}	0.0831	0.0928	0.0830	0.0860
\bar{t} (sec)	3.38	0.906	1.90	4.89
$k_m(k_M)$	26(26)	7(7)	14(14)	36(38)
NL = 10^{-4}				
$\bar{\lambda}$	6.98×10^{-3}	6.82×10^{-4}	1.09×10^{-4}	1.09×10^{-4}
\bar{E}	0.0659	0.0925	0.0698	0.0697
\bar{t} (sec)	21.0	0.925	6.18	6.25
$k_m(k_M)$	137(137)	7(7)	44(44)	45(45)

Table 2: Results for the test problem *rice* with $tol = 10^{-4}$

All proposed methods converged faster than the existing method PROJ-L from Table 1. Previous experiments suggested to us that PROJ-L converged comparatively faster in all of the solvers for the general form of the Tikhonov regularization, and were dependent on the noise level. The GKB-GCV($r^{(k)}$) and the GKB-GCV($r^{(1)}$) also were dependent on noise level. The GKB-GCV($r^{(k)}$) had the same dependence as the PROJ-L. The dependence of the GKB-GCV($r^{(1)}$) was smaller than that of the GKB-GCV($r^{(k)}$). The results for the GKB-GCV($r^{(1)}$) were not much different for NL = 10^{-2} and 10^{-3} . Regarding numerical precision, all results of the proposed methods were worse than PROJ-L, except for the results of the GKB-GCV($r^{(1)}$) for NL = 10^{-2} . Because the GKB-GCV(\hat{G}) is independent of noise levels unlike the other methods, the relative error did not decrease with the noise level. The relative error of the GKB-GCV(\hat{G}) was about 1.5 times as more than the PROJ-L when the noise level was small.

4.2 Test problem 2: *rice*

The next step was to create a 256×256 original image of *rice*. $A \in \mathbb{R}^{65536 \times 65536}$, $L \in \mathbb{R}^{130560 \times 65536}$ and $\text{cond}(A) \approx 3.40 \times 10^{16}$. The same experiment was performed using NL = 10^{-2} and 10^{-3} this time. The same notation was used for the case of *rice64*. The computation of the FP method on PROJ-L started with $p_0 = 15$ and $\mu = 1$, and $tol = 10^{-4}$, for the stopping criteria.

Similar results were obtained for *rice64*, with the exception of GKB-GCV($r^{(1)}$) for NL = 10^{-2} . Results from the GKB-GCV($r^{(1)}$) for NL = 10^{-2} was slow with less numerical accuracy than the GKB-GCV($r^{(k)}$) and the PROJ-L. One of the reason for this, is that hybrid methods do not have properties of monotone convergence. The stopping rules of hybrid methods must not be too severe or too easy. An easy approach for solving this problem was employed, which used two stopping rules. Specifically, both equations (15) and (16) were applied to the stopping rule. Please see Figure 1 for the original image, deblurred image, and resolution images.




Figure 1: Resolution image of *rice* with $NL = 10^{-2}$

5 Conclusion

The GKB-GCV is a new solver for the general form of the Tikhonov regularization problem; it is based on the W-GCV. The GKB-GCV was compared to the PROJ-L and the GKB-GCV, using different stopping rules by using two image deblurring problems. The results of the numerical experiments showed that each of the proposed methods had good advantages. The GKB-GCV(\hat{G}) was the fastest, although its numerical precision was the worst in all scenarios. This was because the GKB-GCV(\hat{G}) does not depend on noise level. Secondly, the GKB-GCV($r^{(k)}$) was very fast, but had less accuracy compared to the PROJ-L for all noise levels, while it had the the same dependency on noise levels to PROJ-L. Lastly, the GKB-GCV($r^{(1)}$) had a smaller dependence on noise level than GKB-GCV($r^{(k)}$) and PROJ-L.

References

- [1] Bazán, F. S. V., “Fixed-point iterations in determining the Tikhonov regularization parameter,” *Inverse Problems*, Vol. 24, 035001, 2008.
- [2] Bazán, F. S. V. and Borges, L. S., “GKB-FP: an algorithm for large-scale discrete ill-posed problems,” *BIT*, Vol. 50, pp. 481–507, 2010.

- [3] Bazán, F. S. V., Cunha, M. C. C. and Borges, L. S., “Extension of GKB-FP algorithm to large-scale general-form Tikhonov regularization,” *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.*, Vol. 21, pp. 316–339, 2014.
- [4] Chung, J., Nagy, J. G. and O’Leary, D. P., “A weighted-GCV method for Lanczos-hybrid regularization,” *ETNA*, Vol. 28, pp. 149–167, 2008.
- [5] Golub, G. H., Heath, M. and Wahba, G., “Generalized cross-validation as a method for choosing a good ridge parameter,” *Technometrics*, Vol. 21, pp. 215–222, 1979.
- [6] Hansen, P. C. and O’Leary, D. P., “The use of the L-curve in the regularization of discrete ill-posed problems,” *SIAM J. on Sci. Comput.*, Vol. 14, pp. 1487–1503, 1993.
- [7] Kilmer, M. E., Hansen, P. C., Español, M. I., “A projection-based approach to general-form Tikhonov regularization,” *SIAM J. on Sci. Comput.*, Vol. 29, pp. 315–330, 2007.
- [8] Lampe, J., Reichel, L. and Voss, H., “Large-scale Tikhonov regularization via reduction by orthogonal projection,” *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, Vol. 436, pp. 2845–2865, 2012.
- [9] Novati, P., and Russo, M. R., “A GCV based Arnoldi-Tikhonov regularization method,” *BIT Numer. Math.*, Vol. 54, pp. 501–521, 2014.
- [10] Reichel, L., Sgallari, F. and Ye, Q., “Tikhonov regularization based on generalized Krylov subspace methods,” *Appl. Numer. Math.*, Vol. 62, pp. 1215–1228, 2012.
- [11] Tikhonov, A. N., “Solution of incorrectly formulated problems and the regularization method,” *Soviet Mathematics Doklady*, Vol. 4, pp. 1035–1038, 1963.

Department of Mathematics
Faculty of Science and Technology
Keio University

Research Report

2014

- [14/001] A. Larraín-Hubach, Y. Maeda, S. Rosenberg, F. Torres-Ardila,
Equivariant, strong and leading order characteristic classes associated to fibrations,
KSTS/RR-14/001, January 6, 2014
- [14/002] Ryoichi Suzuki,
A Clark-Ocone type formula under change of measure for canonical Lévy processes,
KSTS/RR-14/002, March 12, 2014

2015

- [15/001] Shiro Ishikawa,
Linguistic interpretation of quantum mechanics: Quantum Language,
KSTS/RR-15/001, January 22, 2015
- [15/002] Takuji Arai, Ryoichi Suzuki,
Local risk-minimization for Lévy markets,
KSTS/RR-15/002, February 2, 2015
- [15/003] Kazuma Teramoto, Takashi Nodera,
Lanczos type method for computing PageRank,
KSTS/RR-15/003, March 9, 2015
- [15/004] Yoichi Matsuo, Takashi Nodera,
Block symplectic Gram-Schmidt method,
KSTS/RR-15/004, March 9, 2015
- [15/005] Yuto Yokota, Takashi Nodera,
The L-BFGS method for nonlinear GMRES acceleration,
KSTS/RR-15/005, March 9, 2015
- [15/006] Takatoshi Nakamura, Takashi Nodera,
The flexible incomplete LU preconditioner for large nonsymmetric linear systems,
KSTS/RR-15/006, April 13, 2015
- [15/007] Takuro Kutsukake, Takashi Nodera,
The deflated flexible GMRES with an approximate inverse preconditioner,
KSTS/RR-15/007, April 15, 2015
- [15/008] Dai Togashi, Takashi Nodera,
The GKB-GCV method for solving the general form of the Tikhonov regularization,
KSTS/RR-15/008, September 29, 2015