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In this note, following suggestions by Tao [2], we extend the randomized algorithm for linear equations over prime fields by Raghavendra [1] to a randomized algorithm for linear equations over the reals. We also show that the algorithm can be parallelized to solve a system of linear equations $Ax = b$ with a regular $n \times n$ matrix $A$ in time $O(n^2)$, with probability one. Note that we do not assume that $A$ is symmetric.

Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m \leq n$ and consider an $m \times n$ matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ as well as a right-hand side vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. There are many applications in which it is known in advance that $A$ has full row rank, i.e. the system of linear equations $Ax = b$ has at least one solution. We are interested in solving such a system in the sense that we want to

*The author is indebted to Ian Hawke, School of Mathematics, University of Southampton, for pointing out an error in a previous version of this note.
construct a vector \( \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \) that fulfills these equations, given the knowledge that \( \mathbf{A} \) has full row rank. This has, of course, important applications for the case \( m = n \). For this problem, we consider the algorithm described below. In what follows, let \( \mathbf{A} \) have the row vectors \( \mathbf{a}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_m \in \mathbb{R}^n \), i.e.

\[
\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix}
\mathbf{a}_1^\top \\
\vdots \\
\mathbf{a}_m^\top
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

We consider a random vector \( \xi : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \) defined on some probability space \((\Theta, \mathcal{F}, P)\), for which the following holds.

**Assumption 1** For arbitrary \( \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{a} \neq 0, \) and \( \beta \in \mathbb{R} \) we have

\[
\text{Prob} (\mathbf{a}^\top \xi = \beta) = 0.
\]

In other words, the random vector is not biased towards particular affine subspaces of \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Examples for corresponding distributions include the case in which each coordinate \( \xi_i (i = 1, \ldots, n) \) is independently drawn from a Gaussian distribution on \( \mathbb{R} \), or from a uniform distribution over a certain interval, or in which \( \xi \) is continuous uniformly distributed on the unit sphere \( \{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2 = 1 \} \). From the assumption, it follows readily that

\[
\text{Prob} (\xi = \mathbf{x}) = 0.
\]

for all \( \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \), as \( \text{Prob} (\xi = \mathbf{x}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \text{Prob} (\mathbf{(e}^{(i)})^\top \xi = x_i) = 0 \), where \( \mathbf{e}^{(i)} \) are the Cartesian unit vectors \( (i = 1, \ldots, n) \). For technical reasons, we will also assume that \( \xi(F) \) is a measurable set (in the usual sense of the natural Borel \( \sigma \)-Algebra of \( \mathbb{R}^n \)) for all \( F \in \mathcal{F} \).

We are now ready to state the main algorithm.

1. **Input:** \((\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{b})\) with matrix \( \mathbf{A} \) as row vectors \( \mathbf{a}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_m \in \mathbb{R}^n \), and a right-hand side \( \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m \).

2. Let \( \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_{n+1} \in \mathbb{R}^n \) denote identically independent distributed samples of the random variable \( \xi \).

3. for \( k = 1, \ldots, m \) do
(a) Choose \( n+1 \) random pairs \((i_1, j_1), \ldots, (i_{n+1}, j_{n+1})\) with \( i_\ell < j_\ell \) for \( \ell = 1, \ldots, n+1 \), and all pairs unequal to each other.

(b) for \( \ell = 1, \ldots, n+1 \) do

   i. \( x_\ell := \text{rec}(v_{i_\ell}, v_{j_\ell}, a_k, b_k) \)

(c) if one of the calls to \( \text{rec} \) stops with failure, then STOP with failure

(d) Otherwise, set \( v_\ell := x_\ell \) for \( \ell = 1, \ldots, n \)

4. Output: \( v_1, \ldots, v_{n+1} \).

This algorithm makes use of the subroutine \( \text{rec} \) ("recombination"), defined as follows:

1. Input: \((u, v, a, \beta)\) with vectors \( u, v, a \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and a real number \( \beta \).

2. if \( a^T(u - v) = 0 \) then STOP with failure

3. Otherwise, set

   \[ t := \frac{\beta - a^Tv}{a^T(u - v)} \]

   and set \( z := tu + (1 - t)v \).

4. Output: \( z \).

In what follows, we will show the following.

**Theorem 1** Suppose \( A \) has full row rank and that Assumption 1 holds.

1. With probability one, the randomized algorithm described above stops after \( m \) steps with output \( v_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^n \), \( \ell = 1, \ldots, n+1 \), such that \( Av_\ell = b \) holds for \( \ell = 1, \ldots, n+1 \).

2. With probability one, the run time of the algorithm is bounded by \( O(n^2m) \) floating point operations.

From this, the following corollary immediately follows.
Corollary 1 Consider a regular matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, a right-hand side $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and suppose that Assumption [1] holds. Then, with probability one, the randomized algorithm above solves the linear system of equations $Ax = b$ in $O(n^3)$ floating point operations.

As it can be clearly seen, Step 3 of the algorithm can be fully parallelized. As each call to $\text{rec}$ costs $O(n)$ flops, we arrive at the main result of this note.

Corollary 2 Consider a regular matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, a right-hand side $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and suppose that Assumption [4] holds. Then the randomized algorithm above can then be parallelized such that, with probability one, it solves the linear system of equations $Ax = b$ in time $O(n^2)$.

We start the analysis with a straightforward result.

Lemma 1 Consider vectors $u, v, a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $a \neq 0$ and a real number $\beta$. Then, either $a^\top (u - v) = 0$ or the subroutine $\text{rec}$ returns a vector $z = tu + (1 - t)v$ with $a^\top z = \beta$.

Proof: By construction. □

Next, we consider the first $i$ iterations of the algorithm.

Lemma 2 Let Assumption [4] hold, let $1 \leq i \leq m$ and let $a_1, \ldots, a_i$ be linearly independent. Then, the following holds.

1. With probability one the algorithm has not stopped with failure in the first $i$ iterations and the vectors $v_\ell = v_\ell^{(i)}$ ($\ell = 1, \ldots, n + 1$), produced in step $i$ of the algorithm, satisfy $a_j^\top v_\ell = b_j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, i$ and $\ell = 1, \ldots, n + 1$.

2. Let $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be an arbitrary vector with $a \neq 0$ and let $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ be arbitrary. Then, for all $\ell = 1, \ldots, n + 1$, $a^\top v_\ell = \beta$ holds with probability zero, where $v_\ell = v_\ell^{(i)}$ denote the iteration vectors of the algorithm after step $i$.

Proof. We show both claims by induction.

1. $i = 1$: claim 2 follows directly from Assumption [4]. Claim 1 follows from Lemma [4] as $A$ has full rank and $a_j^\top (v_i - v_j) = 0$ holds with probability zero for all $i, j = 1, \ldots, n + 1, i \neq j$. 
2. $i \rightarrow i + 1 \leq m$: We start with claim 1. Suppose that $v_\ell$ satisfy $a_j^\top v_\ell = b_j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, i$ and $\ell = 1, \ldots, n + 1$. Let $(\ell_1, \ell_2)$ be a randomly chosen pair of indices with $1 \leq \ell_1 < \ell_2 \leq n + 1$. Without loss of generality, assume $\ell_1 = 1$ and $\ell_2 = 2$. If $\text{rec}(v_1, v_2, a_{i+1}, b_{i+1})$ returns a vector $x$ without failure, then $a_{i+1}^\top x = b_{i+1}$ by Lemma 1. Also, $x$ is a convex combination of $v_1$ and $v_2$ and thus fulfills $a_j^\top x = b_j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, i$. But, due to claim 2, the call $\text{rec}(v_1, v_2, a_{i+1}, b_{i+1})$ returns without failure with probability one. This shows claim 1.

It remains to perform the inductive step for claim 2. As above, let us choose the pair of vectors $v_1, v_2$ without loss of generality. Due to the induction hypothesis, we have, with probability one,

$$x = \frac{b_i - a_i^\top v_2}{a_i^\top (v_1 - v_2)}v_1 + \left(1 - \frac{b_i - a_i^\top v_2}{a_i^\top (v_1 - v_2)}\right)v_2$$

$$= \frac{1}{a_i^\top (v_1 - v_2)}((b_i - a_i^\top v_2)v_1 - (b_i - a_i^\top v_1)v_2)$$

and therefore $a^\top x = \beta$ if and only if

$$(b_i - a_i^\top v_2)a^\top v_1 = (b_i - a_i^\top v_1)a^\top v_2 + \beta a_i^\top (v_1 - v_2)$$

holds. Thus,

$$\text{Prob}(a^\top x = \beta)$$

$$= \text{Prob}\left((b_i - a_i^\top v_2)a^\top v_1 = (b_i - a_i^\top v_1)a^\top v_2 + \beta a_i^\top (v_1 - v_2)\right)$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \text{Prob}\left((b_i - a_i^\top v_2)a^\top v_1 = \zeta \text{ and } \zeta = (b_i - a_i^\top v_1)a^\top v_2 + \beta a_i^\top (v_1 - v_2)\right) d\zeta$$

$$\leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \text{Prob}\left((b_i - a_i^\top v_2)a^\top v_1 = \zeta\right) + \text{Prob}\left(\zeta = (b_i - a_i^\top v_1)a^\top v_2 + \beta a_i^\top (v_1 - v_2)\right) d\zeta,$$

where the existence of the integrals are guaranteed as $\zeta$ maps measurable sets on measurable sets, by assumption. But

$$\text{Prob}\left(\zeta = (b_i - a_i^\top v_1)a^\top v_2 + \beta a_i^\top (v_1 - v_2)\right)$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \text{Prob}\left(\zeta = (b_i - a_i^\top v_1)a^\top v_2 + \beta \eta \text{ and } \eta = a_i^\top (v_1 - v_2)\right) d\eta$$

$$\leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \text{Prob}\left(\zeta = (b_i - a_i^\top v_1)a^\top v_2 + \beta \eta\right) + \text{Prob}\left(\eta = a_i^\top (v_1 - v_2)\right) d\eta$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \text{Prob}\left(\zeta - \beta \eta = (b_i - a_i^\top v_1)a^\top v_2\right) d\eta$$
for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$, which shows
\[
\text{Prob} \left( \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{x} = \beta \right) \\
\leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \text{Prob} \left( (b_i - \mathbf{a}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_2) \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{v}_1 = \zeta \right) + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \text{Prob} \left( \zeta - \beta \eta = (b_i - \mathbf{a}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_1) \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{v}_2 \right) \, d\eta \, d\zeta.
\]

Now, for $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\zeta \neq 0$,
\[
\text{Prob} \left( (b_i - \mathbf{a}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_2) \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{v}_1 = \zeta \right) \\
= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \text{Prob} \left( (b_i - \mathbf{a}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_2) \theta = \zeta \text{ and } \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{v}_1 = \theta \right) \, d\theta \\
\leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \text{Prob} \left( (b_i - \mathbf{a}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_2) \theta = \zeta \right) + \text{Prob} \left( \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{v}_1 = \theta \right) \, d\theta \\
= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \text{Prob} \left( (b_i - \mathbf{a}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_2) \theta = \zeta \right) \, d\theta \\
= \int_{-\infty}^{0} \text{Prob} \left( b_i - \mathbf{a}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_2 = \zeta / \theta \right) \, d\theta + \int_{0}^{\infty} \text{Prob} \left( b_i - \mathbf{a}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_2 = \zeta / \theta \right) \, d\theta \\
= 0
\]

and
\[
\text{Prob} \left( (b_i - \mathbf{a}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_2) \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{v}_1 = 0 \right) = \text{Prob} \left( b_i = \mathbf{a}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_2 \text{ or } \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{v}_1 = 0 \right) \\
\leq \text{Prob} \left( b_i = \mathbf{a}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_2 \right) + \text{Prob} \left( \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{v}_1 = 0 \right) \\
= 0.
\]

In a similar fashion, it can be shown that
\[
\text{Prob} \left( \zeta - \beta \eta = (b_i - \mathbf{a}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_1) \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{v}_2 \right) = 0
\]
for all $\zeta, \eta \in \mathbb{R}$. As a consequence, $\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{x} = \beta$ holds with probability zero. It is clear that the same analysis can be conducted for all other pairs of vectors $\mathbf{v}_{\ell_1}, \mathbf{v}_{\ell_2}$ with $\ell_1 < \ell_2$. \hfill \square

Lemma 2 invoked for $i = m$, shows part 1 of Theorem 1. It remains to discuss the complexity of the algorithm. The for-loop is over $m$ steps, and each step involves three calls to $\text{rec}$. Executing $\text{rec}$ costs two inner products of vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$, two multiplications of vectors with scalars and one vector addition, i.e. the complexity of a call to $\text{rec}$ is $O(n)$. These considerations show Part 2 of Theorem 1.

Some remarks are in order.
- It is clear that the algorithm also works for complex matrices $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ and complex right-hand sides $b \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Again, no symmetry assumption on $A$ is necessary.

- Some bookkeeping shows that the big-$O$ constant of the run time of the algorithm is ca. 15. While this appears large as compared to the big-$O$ constant of Gaussian elimination, $1/3$, note that $15n^2 < n^3/3$ for $n > 45$.

- The algorithm is optimal in the sense that its run time is of the same order as its input size $(A, b)$.

- The algorithm does not need to access the row vectors $a_1, \ldots, a_m$ directly; instead, it suffices to provide a routine that computes the action $a_j^\top v$ of a row $a_j$ on an arbitrary vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

- If the algorithm stops with failure in step $k$, then we have $a_j^\top u_k = a_j^\top v_k = a_j^\top w_k = b_k$ for $j = 1, \ldots, k-1$, i.e. the algorithm provides at least solutions to a subset of the system of equations.

- Stability issues: part of the stability of the algorithm rests on the size of quantities of the form $1/(a_{k+1}^\top (u - v))$. It is, at present, unclear how this quantity can be bounded away from zero.

- In the exposition above, exactly $n + 1$ vectors $v_\ell$ are iteration vectors within the algorithm. We can, of course, use more than $n + 1$ vectors to iterate over, and choose in each step $L > n + 1$ pairs of vectors $v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}$ from the current iterates to feed into $\text{rec}$. This increases the complexity of the algorithm from $O(n^2 m)$ to $O(Lnm)$. However, choosing the right pairs of iterates $v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}$ in an adaptive fashion, possibly discarding results whose norm is too large, might alleviate the stability issues mentioned above.

- Another way that might be useful to stabilize the method at hand is to measure the degeneracy of a pair $(v_i, v_j)$ chosen in an iteration. If, say, $\|v_i - v_j\|$ is smaller than a certain threshold, the pair can either be discarded, or $v_j$ can be replaced by $v_i + c(v_j - u_i)$ for a certain $c > 1$. A value of $0 < c < 1$ can be chosen if $\|v_j - v_i\|$ grows too large.

- In Step 3 (a), it is not necessary to always choose $n + 1$ pairs of indices (and thus generate resp. update all of the vectors $v_1, \ldots, v_{n+1}$. Indeed, after $k$ steps of the main loop, all those vectors are in the $k$-dimensional affine subspace defined by the first $k$ equations $a_i^\top x = b_i$ ($i = 1, \ldots, k$) and will remain in this subspace for all
further iterations. Thus, after step $k$, only $n + 1 - k$ pairs are needed to generate corresponding $n + 1 - k$ new vectors.
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