Algorithm	$\overline{\omega}_f$	$\overline{\omega}_b$	It	Fl $\times 10^6$	Fl_{tot} $\times 10^6$	E_{tot}
pmRecEWA	1.1731	1.1731	77	0.693	2.412	1.78
lmRecEWA	1.	1.3088	73	0.526	1.884	1.39
lmRecEWA	1.1569	1.1569	73	0.657	1.917	1.42
pmRecAGA-A	1.1319	1.1319	62	0.614	1.515	1.12
lmRecAGA-A	1.	1.2477	57	0.462	1.492	1.10
lmRecAGA-A	1.1190	1.1190	59	0.584	1.564	1.16
pmRecAGA-B	1.	1.2862	69	0.621	1.791	1.32
pmRecAGA-B	1.1436	1.1436	68	0.734	2.052	1.52
lmRecAGA-B	1.	1.2626	67	0.603	1.782	1.35
lmRecAGA-B	1.1365	1.1365	69	0.745	1.987	1.47
RecAGA-B1	1.1063	1.1063	53	0.572	1.480	1.09
lmRecAGA-B1	1.0894	1.0894	48	0.562	1.511	1.12
plmRecAGA-B2	1.0756	1.0756	43	0.581	1.543	1.14
RecAGA-C(2)	1.1376	1.1376	67	0.844	2.296	1.70
pmRecAGA-C(2)	1.1159	1.1159	57	0.770	2.174	1.61
lmRecAGA-C(2)	1.1048	1.1048	53	0.716	1.972	1.46
RecAGA-C(3)	1.2524	1.	65	0.995	2.678	1.98
RecAGA-C(3)	1.1294	1.1294	65	1.112	3.438	2.54
pmRecAGA-C(3)	1.2544	1.	52	0.842	2.300	1.70
pmRecAGA-C(3)	1.1092	1.1092	56	1.008	2.591	1.92
lmRecAGA-C(3)	1.	1.2144	50	0.810	2.235	1.65
lmRecAGA-C(3)	1.0989	1.0989	51	0.918	2.538	1.88
lmRecAGA-D	1.0704	1.0704	40	0.612	1.683	1.24
plmRecAGA-D1	1.0641	1.0641	38	0.616	1.847	1.37
plmRecAGA9R-A2	**1.0721**	**1.0721**	**30**	**0.270**	**0.648**	**0.48**
RecSLOR	–	**1.7505**	**117**	**0.824**	**1.352**	**1.00**
plmRecAGA9-A	1.0978	1.0978	48	0.864	2.602	1.30
pmRecAGA9-A1	1.0875	1.0875	44	0.871	2.139	1.06
plmRecAGA9-A1	1.0826	1.0826	43	0.890	2.505	1.25
RecSLOR9	–	1.7504	117	1.264	2.009	1.00

TABLE B.1.7. Problem A(b) ($30 \times 30 = 900$ mesh points). It is the number of iterations needed to obtain a solution, Fl is the corresponding computational work, $Fl_{tot} = Fl_p + Fl$ is the total computational work, and E_{tot} is the total coefficient of efficiency defined in (B.2). Only the plmRecAGA9R-A2 double SOR algorithm (marked in bold) is efficient compared to RecSLOR (also marked in bold); its total coefficient of efficiency is 0.48.

Variant A(c), with $M = N = 60$

Results for variant A(c) are shown in tables B.1.8 and B.1.9. The convergence behavior of particular algorithms compared to RecSLOR is similar to that for variant A(b).

However, the values of E_{tot} (table B.1.9) decrease for some algorithms, for example, the lmRecEWA and lmRecAGA-A backward SOR and RecAGA-B1 with double SOR, which are equivalent to RecSLOR.

Algorithm	ω_f	ω_b	ϱ_ω	It_p	Fl_p $\times 10^6$	$\overline{\omega}_f$	$\overline{\omega}_b$	$\bar{\varrho}_\omega$
	1.13	1.13	0.969558	144				
pmRecEWA	1.15	1.15	0.960442	114	13.93	1.1964	1.1964	0.8112
	1.16	1.16	0.953559	129				
	1.	1.3	0.938849	113				
lmRecEWA	1.	1.33	0.910605	55	8.179	1.	1.3565	0.7889
	1.	1.35	0.862104	116				
	1.13	1.13	0.961363	125				
lmRecEWA	1.15	1.15	0.946047	101	11.63	1.1798	1.1798	0.8043
	1.16	1.16	0.932503	97				
	1.11	1.11	0.950654	95				
pmRecAGA-A	1.12	1.12	0.941253	71	8.871	1.1526	1.1526	0.7703
	1.13	1.13	0.927332	58				
	1.	1.23	0.927517	97				
lmRecAGA-A	1.	1.25	0.909047	79	7.777	1.	1.2903	0.7376
	1.	1.26	0.895544	64				
	1.11	1.11	0.933962	92				
lmRecAGA-A	1.12	1.12	0.916584	58	7.643	1.1390	1.1390	0.7579
	1.13	1.13	0.884617	43				
	1.	1.25	0.949334	135				
pmRecAGA-B	1.	1.27	0.939487	109	12.62	1.	1.3335	0.7772
	1.	1.28	0.933016	107				
	1.11	1.11	0.962387	135				
pmRecAGA-B	1.13	1.13	0.949016	121	14.17	1.1660	1.1660	0.7912
	1.15	1.15	0.920444	72				
	1.	1.25	0.937278	105				
lmRecAGA-B	1.	1.27	0.920737	87	9.164	1.	1.3078	0.7761
	1.	1.28	0.908405	62				
	1.12	1.12	0.951007	119				
lmRecAGA-B	1.13	1.13	0.941067	99	12.27	1.1589	1.1589	0.7889
	1.14	1.14	0.925801	75				
	1.07	1.07	0.953446	68				
RecAGA-B1	1.09	1.09	0.936500	51	6.783	1.1257	1.1257	0.7255
	1.11	1.11	0.899823	38				
	1.08	1.08	0.920394	76				
lmRecAGA-B1	1.09	1.09	0.898721	57	8.191	1.1080	1.1080	0.7137
	1.1	1.1	0.857723	42				
	1.07	1.07	0.900608	55				
plmRecAGA-B2	1.08	1.08	0.868234	42	7.576	1.0929	1.0929	0.6811
	1.09	1.09	0.790356	47				

TABLE B.1.8. Problem A(c) ($60 \times 60 = 3600$ mesh points). The table is continued.