

An increasing rank Riemannian method for generalized Lyapunov equations

Zhenwei Huang¹ and Wen Huang²

¹ School of Mathematical Sciences, Xiamen University, Xiamen, China.

² Corresponding author, School of Mathematical Sciences, Xiamen University, Xiamen, China.

August 2, 2023

Abstract

In this paper, we consider finding a low-rank approximation to the solution of a large-scale generalized Lyapunov matrix equation in the form of $AXM + MXA = C$, where A and M are symmetric positive definite matrices. An algorithm called an Increasing Rank Riemannian method for generalized Lyapunov equation (IRRLyap) is proposed by merging the increasing rank technique and Riemannian optimization techniques on the quotient manifold $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$. To efficiently solve the optimization problem on $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$, a line-search-based Riemannian inexact Newton method is developed with its global convergence and local superlinear convergence rate guaranteed. Moreover, we investigate the influence of the existing three Riemannian metrics on $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$ and derive new preconditioners which takes $M \neq I$ into consideration. Numerical experiments show that IRRLyap with one of the Riemannian metrics is most efficient and robust in general and is preferable compared to the tested state-of-the-art methods when the lowest rank solution is desired.

Keywords: Generalized Lyapunov equations, Riemannian optimization, Low-rank approximation, Riemannian truncated Newton's method, Increasing rank method

1 Introduction

This paper considers the large-scale generalized Lyapunov matrix equation

$$AXM + MXA - C = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

where $A, M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are symmetric positive definite matrices and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is symmetric. It has been shown in [Chu87] and [Pen98] that Equation (1.1) has a unique solution X^* and X^* is symmetric. Moreover, it is known that under certain circumstances such as C is low rank, the solution X^* of the Lyapunov equation (1.1) can be well approximated by a low-rank matrix, since the eigenvalues of the solution X^* numerically has an exponential decay [Pen00, Gra04].

In recent years, solving Equation (1.1) has attracted much attention since it plays a significant role in model reduction [Moo81, SVdVR08, HJR21, GGB22], signal processing [GDA⁺20], systems and control theory [J96, Ant05], and solutions of PDEs [PS16].

1.1 Contributions

In this paper, Problem (1.1) is formulated as an optimization problem on a quotient manifold $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$ (see definition in Section 2). A line-search-based Riemannian truncated Newton method is developed by using the truncated Newton in [DS83a] and the line search conditions in [BN89]. The global convergence and local superlinear convergence rates are established. As far as we know, this is the first line-search-based generic Riemannian inexact Newton method for optimization and guarantees global and local superlinear convergence. In addition, the line search conditions that we used allow conditions other than the Wolfe conditions in [DS83a]. We equip the quotient manifold $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$ with three existing Riemannian metrics and explore the performance of the Riemannian truncated Newton method and the influence of those metrics for solving (1.1). Moreover, we propose new preconditioners which are more effective compared to the one in [VV10] in the sense that the new ones take $M \neq I$ into consideration whereas the one in [VV10] does not. We finally combine the Riemannian truncated Newton method with the increasing rank algorithm in [VV10] and give an algorithm for solving (1.1). Numerically, the proposed Riemannian truncated Newton’s method is able to find higher accurate solutions compared to the Riemannian trust-region Newton’s method in [ABG07]; the proposed preconditioners can further reduce the number of actions of the Hessian evaluations when $M \neq I$ compared to the preconditioner in [VV10]; and the increasing rank method with the Riemannian truncated Newton method is able to find lower rank solutions compared to the three state-of-the-art low-rank methods K-PIK [Sim07], mess_lradi [SKB22], and RLyap [VV10] when the residual $\|AXM + MXA - C\|_F$ is roughly the same.

1.2 Related Work

Classical numerical methods for the standard Lyapunov matrix equations, i.e., setting $M = I$, include the Bartels-Stewart method [BS72], the Hessenberg–Schur method [GNVL79], and the Hammarling method [Ham82]. These methods are direct methods and the computations involve $O(n^3)$ number of floating point operations, which prevents the use for large-scale problems, where the floating point operation is defined in [GL96]. One approach to develop an efficient method for large-scale problems is to explore the low-rank structure of the solution X^* .

Low-rank methods for Lyapunov equations. In practice, there is a class of applications of generalized Lyapunov equation (1.1), whose solution can be approximated with a low-rank matrix of rank $p \ll n$. In this case, the number of unknowns is reduced to np , which is greatly less than n^2 . If we can compute a low-rank approximation in $O(np^c)$ operations with constant c , for large problems, then the complexity is significantly reduced. Based on this idea, very diverse low-rank methods have been proposed. Majority of these methods are based on Smith method [GSA03], low-rank alternating direction implicit iterative (LR-ADI) [LW04, BLT09, BK14, BPS22], sign function methods [BB06, Bau08], Krylov subspace techniques [Sim07, DS11, HJR21], and Riemannian optimization [VV10]. It is worth noting that there exist several low-rank methods for algebraic Riccati equations [MV14, BHW21], which, in some cases, are also suited for Lyapunov equations.

The low-rank methods listed above in addition to [VV10, MV14] all start from well-known iterative methods and skillfully rewrite the problem so that the problem can be transformed into a low-rank setting. Although the calculations of these methods are cheap at each step since they work on a factor Y of iterate $X = YY^T$, the convergence rate of these methods is usually unknown or at most linear and no good acceleration strategy has been given. As a consequence, Bart et al.

[VV10] reformulated Equation (1.1) into an optimization problem defined on the set of fixed rank symmetric positive semidefinite matrices. In this paper, we follow this idea but from the perspective of quotient manifold and propose a Riemannian Newton’s method to solve the problem.

Riemannian Newton’s methods. Newton’s method is a powerful tool for finding the minimizer of nonlinear functions in Euclidean spaces. Although Newton’s method has a fast local convergence rate, it is highly sensitive to the initial iterate (i.e., it is not globally convergent); it is not defined at points where the Hessian is singular; and for non-convex problems, it does not necessarily generate a sequence of descent directions. In order to overcome these issues, Dembo et al. [DS83a] proposed a truncated-Newton method. The truncated-Newton method contains two parts. The outer iteration executes Newton’s method based on line search, and the inner iteration solves the Newton equation inexactly by a truncated conjugate gradient method. Absil et al. [ABG07] proposed a Riemannian trust-region Newton’s method similar to this idea which is based on the trust-region method. The proposed method is a generalization of the one in [DS83a] to manifolds and further relaxes the line search condition used in [DS83a]. It is worth mentioning that there are some Riemannian Newton’s methods based on line search; see, e.g., [dABFFY18, ZBJ18, WZB20, dABFF22]. As far as we know, all the existing Riemannian Newton’s methods aim to find a root of a vector field, whereas the proposed Riemannian truncated-Newton’s method is used to optimize a sufficiently smooth function.

1.3 Outline

This paper is stated as follows. In Section 2, we introduce preliminaries on algebra and manifold. In Section 3, we reformulate Equation (1.1) as an optimization problem on quotient manifold $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$. The classical truncated Newton method is generalized to Riemannian setting in Section 4 and it is proven that the proposed Riemannian truncated Newton’s method converges to a stationary point from any starting point and has a local superlinear convergence rate. In Section 5, we give ingredients for optimization on Riemannian quotient manifolds with three metrics. In Section 6, The proposed preconditioners under the three metrics are discussed, and the increasing rank algorithm for solving Equation (1.1) is given. Finally, in Section 7, we demonstrate the performance of the three metrics and preconditioners, and compare the proposed method with other existing low-rank methods for Lyapunov equations.

2 Preliminaries and Notation

Throughout this paper, we denote the real matrices space of size m -by- n by $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. For $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, the matrix $A^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ denotes the transpose of A . Define $\text{vec}(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{mn}$ as an isomorphism operator which transforms a matrix into a vector by column-wise stacking, that is, for any $A = [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. We have $\text{vec}(A) = [a_1^T, a_2^T, \dots, a_n^T] \in \mathbb{R}^{mn}$. Let \otimes denote the Kronecker product, i.e., for $A = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $B = [b_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$, it holds that $A \otimes B = [a_{ij}B] \in \mathbb{R}^{mp \times nq}$.

Riemannian geometry. The Riemannian geometry used in this paper can be found in the standard literature, e.g., [Boo75, AMS08], and the notation below follows [AMS08]. Denote a manifold by \mathcal{M} . For any $x \in \mathcal{M}$, $T_x\mathcal{M}$ is the tangent space of \mathcal{M} at x and elements in $T_x\mathcal{M}$ are call tangent vectors of \mathcal{M} . Tangent bundle, $T\mathcal{M}$, of manifold \mathcal{M} is the union set of all tangent spaces. Mapping $\eta : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow T\mathcal{M}$ maps a point $x \in \mathcal{M}$ into a tangent vector $\eta_x \in T_x\mathcal{M}$ and is

called a vector field. A metric on a manifold \mathcal{M} is defined as $g(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{T}\mathcal{M} \oplus \mathbb{T}\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathbb{T}\mathcal{M} \oplus \mathbb{T}\mathcal{M} = \{(\eta_x, \xi_x) : x \in \mathcal{M}, \eta_x \in \mathcal{T}_x\mathcal{M}, \xi_x \in \mathcal{T}_x\mathcal{M}\}$ is the Whitney sum of tangent bundle. Given $\eta_x \in \mathcal{T}_x\mathcal{M}$, its induced norm is defined by $\|\eta_x\| = \sqrt{g(\eta_x, \eta_x)}$. If g is smooth in the sense that for any two smooth vector fields ξ and η , function $g(\xi, \eta) : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth, then \mathcal{M} equipped with g is a Riemannian manifold and g is called a Riemannian metric. If \mathcal{M} is a Riemannian manifold, then the tangent space $\mathbb{T}_x\mathcal{M}$ is a Euclidean space with the Euclidean metric $g_x(\cdot, \cdot) = g(\cdot, \cdot)|_{\mathbb{T}_x\mathcal{M}}$. For a smooth function $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, notations $\text{grad}f(x)$ and $\text{Hess}f(x)$ denote the Riemannian gradient and Hessian of f at x respectively, and the action of $\text{Hess}f(x)$ on a tangent vector $\eta_x \in \mathbb{T}_x\mathcal{M}$ is denoted by $\text{Hess}f(x)[\eta_x]$.

Let $\gamma : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ denote a smooth curve and $\dot{\gamma}(t) \in \mathbb{T}_{\gamma(t)}\mathcal{M}$ denotes its velocity at t , where $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is open and $[0, 1] \subset \mathcal{I}$. The distance between $x = \gamma(0)$ and $y = \gamma(1)$ is defined by $\text{dist}(x, y) = \inf_{\{\gamma : \gamma(0)=x, \gamma(1)=y\}} \int_0^1 \|\dot{\gamma}(t)\| dt$. A smooth curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is called the geodesic if it locally minimizes the distance between $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\gamma(1) = y$. Notation $B_\mu(0_x) = \{\xi_x \in \mathbb{T}_x\mathcal{M} : \|\xi_x\| \leq \mu\}$ is used to denote the open ball in $\mathbb{T}_x\mathcal{M}$ of radius μ centered at 0_x and $B_\mu(x) = \{y \in \mathcal{M} : \text{dist}(x, y) \leq \mu\}$ is an open ball in \mathcal{M} of radius μ centered at x . A retraction $R : \mathbb{T}\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is a map satisfying (i) $R(0_x) = x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and (ii) for each fixed $x \in \mathcal{M}$, $\frac{d}{dt}R(t\eta_x)|_{t=0} = \eta_x$ for all $\eta_x \in \mathbb{T}_x\mathcal{M}$.

The considered manifold. The set of symmetric positive semidefinite matrices of size n with fixed rank p , denoted by $\mathcal{S}_+(p, n)$, is a Riemannian manifold with dimension $np - \frac{1}{2}p(p-1)$ (see, e.g., [HS95]). For any $X \in \mathcal{S}_+(p, n)$, there exists a matrix $Y \in \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$ such that $X = YY^T$, where $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} = \{Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} : \text{rank}(Y) = p\}$ is called a noncompact Stiefel manifold [AMS08, Chapter 3]. The orthogonal group $\mathcal{O}_p = \{O \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} : O^T O = I_p\}$ is a Lie group with the group operator given by the matrix product; it can be equipped with the smooth structure as an embedded submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$; and its identity is the identity matrix I_p . Define a right group action of \mathcal{O}_p on $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$ as:

$$\theta : \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} \times \mathcal{O}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} : \theta(Y, Q) = YQ.$$

Obviously, this group action satisfies the identity and compatibility conditions [Bou20, Definition 9.11], and therefore it induces an equivalent relation \sim on $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$:

$$Z \sim Y \Leftrightarrow Y = \theta(Z, Q) = ZQ \text{ for some } Q \in \mathcal{O}_p.$$

The orbit of Y forms an equivalence class, namely, $[Y] = \{YQ : Q \in \mathcal{O}_p\}$. We denote the quotient space $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \sim$ as $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$. The natural projection between $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$ and $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$ is given by

$$\pi : \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p : Y \mapsto \pi(Y) = [Y].$$

From now on, out of clarity, we denote $[Y]$ by $\pi(Y)$ as an element of the quotient manifold $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$ and use $\pi^{-1}(\pi(Y))$ to denote $[Y]$ when it is regarded as a subset of $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$.

Since the Lie group \mathcal{O}_p acts smoothly, freely and properly with the group action θ on the smooth manifold $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$, by [Bou20, Theorem 9.17], the quotient space $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$ is a manifold called a quotient manifold of $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$. The manifold $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$ is therefore called the total space of $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$. Since $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$ is diffeomorphic to $\mathcal{S}_+(p, n)$, the quotient manifold $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$ can be viewed as a representation of the manifold $\mathcal{S}_+(p, n)$.

Function classes. For the convergence analysis, we need notions of a pullback of a real-valued function f with respect to a retraction R and the radially Lipschitz continuous differentiability of a pullback.

Definition 2.1. Let $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a real-valued function on manifold \mathcal{M} with a retraction R . We call $\hat{f} : \mathbb{T}\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \eta_x \mapsto \hat{f}(\eta_x) = f(R(\eta_x))$ the pullback of f with respect to R . When restricted on $\mathbb{T}_x\mathcal{M}$, we denote $\hat{f}|_{\mathbb{T}_x\mathcal{M}}$ by \hat{f}_x .

Definition 2.2. ([AMS08, Definition 7.4.1]) Let \hat{f} be a pullback of f with respect to a retraction R . \hat{f} is referred to as a radially L - C^1 function for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$ if there exists a positive constant L such that for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and all $\eta_x \in \mathbb{T}_x\mathcal{M}$, it holds that

$$\left| \frac{d}{d\tau} \hat{f}(t\eta_x) \Big|_{t=\tau} - \frac{d}{dt} \hat{f}(t\eta_x) \Big|_{t=0} \right| \leq L\tau \|\eta\|^2, \quad (2.1)$$

where τ and η_x satisfy that $R_x(\tau\eta_x) \in \mathcal{M}$.

Notations. For any $Y \in \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$ with $p < n$, the matrix Y_\perp of size $n \times (n-p)$ denotes the normalized orthogonal complement of Y , i.e., $Y_\perp^T Y_\perp = I_{n-p}$ and $Y_\perp^T Y = 0$. Furthermore, Y_{\perp_M} is the normalized orthogonal complement of MY . The symmetric matrices space of size $n \times n$ is denoted by $\mathcal{S}_n^{\text{sym}}$. For any matrix $X \in \mathcal{S}_n^{\text{sym}}$, the symbols $X \succ 0$ and $X \succeq 0$ mean that X is positive definite and positive semidefinite respectively. For a square matrix X , $\text{trace}(X)$ denotes the sum of all diagonal elements. For $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, let $\text{sym}(Y) = (Y + Y^T)/2$ and $\text{skew}(Y) = (Y - Y^T)/2$.

3 Problem Statement

We consider a fixed-rank optimization formulation of (1.1) in [VV10]

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}} h(X) &:= \text{trace}(XAXM) - \text{trace}(XC), \\ \text{s.t. } X &\in \mathcal{S}_+(p, n). \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Note that the Euclidean gradient of (3.1) is $\nabla h(X) = AXM + MXA - C$. It follows that any stationary point of $h(X)$ is a solution of (1.1). Since $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$ is diffeomorphic to $\mathcal{S}_+(p, n)$, Problem (3.1) can be equivalently reformulated as¹:

$$\min_{\pi(Y)} f : \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \pi(Y) \mapsto h(YY^T) = \text{trace}(Y^T AYY^T MY) - \text{trace}(Y^T CY), \quad (3.2)$$

which is defined on the quotient manifold $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$. Therefore, Riemannian optimization algorithms can be used. Note that Problem (3.2) is different from the Burer and Monteiro approach [BM03] in the sense that [BM03] optimizes over the factor Y but Problem (3.2) is over the quotient manifold $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$.

Problem (3.2) requires a good estimation of the rank p , which is usually unknown in practice. It has been shown in [VV10] that if the rank of the solution of (1.1) is larger than p , then any local minimizer of the fixed-rank formulation (3.2) must have full rank p . Therefore, one can estimate the rank p by using a rank-increasing algorithm. The proposed Riemannian optimization over fixed rank manifold is discussed in Section 4 and the rank-increasing algorithm is described in Section 6.

¹The term ‘‘equivalent’’ means if $X \in \mathcal{S}_+(p, n)$ is a stationary point of h then $\pi(Y) \in \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$ satisfying $X = YY^T$ is also a stationary point of f ; conversely, if $\pi(Y)$ is a stationary point of f , then $X = YY^T$ is a stationary point of h .

4 A Riemannian Truncated Newton's Method

Riemannian optimization has attracted more and more researchers' attention for recent years and many related algorithms have been investigated, such as the Riemannian trust-region methods [ABG07], the Riemannian steepest descent method [AMS08], the Riemannian Barzilai Borwein method [IP18], the Riemannian nonlinear conjugate gradient methods [RW12, Sat16, SI15, Zhu17], the Riemannian versions of quasi-Newton methods [HGA15, HAG15, HAG18, HG22]. This paper considers the Riemannian optimization problems in the form of

$$\min_x f(x) \text{ s.t. } x \in \mathcal{M}, \quad (4.1)$$

where \mathcal{M} is a finite dimensional Riemannian manifold, and $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a real-valued function. It is further assumed throughout this paper that the below assumptions hold.

Assumption 4.1. *f is twice continuously differentiable.*

Assumption 4.2. *For all starting $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ the level set*

$$L(x_0) := \{x \in \mathcal{M} : f(x) \leq f(x_0)\}$$

are bounded.

Assumption 4.3. *f satisfies Definition 2.2.*

4.1 Algorithm Statement

The proposed Riemannian Truncated-Newton's method is stated in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Riemannian Truncated-Newton's method

Input: initial iterate x_0 ; line search parameters χ_1 and $\chi_2 \in (0, 1)$; truncated conjugate gradient parameters $\epsilon > 0$ and a forcing sequence $\{\phi_k\}$ satisfying $\phi_k > 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \phi_k = 0$;

Output: sequence $\{x_k\}$;

- 1: Set $k \leftarrow 0$;
- 2: **while** do not accurate enough **do**
- 3: Approximately solve the Newton equation $\text{Hess } f(x_k)[\eta_k] = -\text{grad } f(x_k)$ by the truncated conjugate gradient algorithm in Algorithm 2 with inputs $(\text{grad } f(x_k), \text{Hess } f(x_k), \epsilon, \phi_k)$;
- 4: Find a step size α_k satisfying

$$h_k(\alpha_k) - h_k(0) \leq -\chi_1 \frac{h'_k(0)^2}{\|\eta_k\|^2}, \quad (4.2)$$

or

$$h_k(\alpha_k) - h_k(0) \leq \chi_2 h'_k(0), \quad (4.3)$$

where $h_k(t) = f(R_{x_k}(t\eta_k))$;

- 5: Set $x_{k+1} \leftarrow R_{x_k}(\alpha_k \eta_k)$;
 - 6: Set $k \leftarrow k + 1$;
 - 7: **end while**
-

Algorithm 2 Truncated Conjugate Gradient Method (tCG)

Input: $(\text{grad}f(x_k), \text{Hess}f(x_k), \epsilon, \phi_k)$, where $\epsilon > 0$ and $\phi_k > 0$;

Output: η_k ;

1: **Initializations:**

Set $\eta^{(0)} \leftarrow 0$, $r^{(0)} \leftarrow -\text{grad}f(x_k)$, $d^{(0)} \leftarrow r^{(0)}$, $\delta^{(0)} \leftarrow g_{x_k}(r^{(0)}, r^{(0)})$, and $i \leftarrow 0$;

2: **Check for negative curvature:**

Set $q^{(i)} \leftarrow \text{Hess}f(x_k)[d^{(i)}]$;

If $g_{x_k}(d^{(i)}, q^{(i)}) \leq \epsilon\delta_i$, return $\eta_k \leftarrow \begin{cases} d^{(0)}, & \text{if } i = 0, \\ \eta^{(i)}, & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$

3: **Generate next inner iterate:**

Set $\alpha^{(i)} \leftarrow g_{x_k}(r^{(i)}, r^{(i)})/g_{x_k}(d^{(i)}, q^{(i)})$;

Set $\eta^{(i+1)} \leftarrow \eta^{(i)} + \alpha^{(i)}d^{(i)}$;

4: **Update residual and search direction:**

Set $r^{(i+1)} \leftarrow r^{(i)} - \alpha^{(i)}q^{(i)}$;

Set $\beta^{(i+1)} \leftarrow g_{x_k}(r^{(i+1)}, r^{(i+1)})/g_{x_k}(r^{(i)}, r^{(i)})$;

Set $d^{(i+1)} \leftarrow r^{(i+1)} + \beta^{(i+1)}d^{(i)}$;

Set $\delta^{(i+1)} \leftarrow g_{x_k}(r^{(i+1)}, r^{(i+1)}) + (\beta^{(i+1)})^2 d^{(i)}$;

5: **Check residual:**

If $\|r^{(i+1)}\|/\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \leq \phi_k$, return $\eta_k \leftarrow \eta^{(i+1)}$;

Set $i \leftarrow i + 1$;

Return to Step 2;

Step 3 of Algorithm 1 invokes Algorithm 2, which approximately solves the Newton equation $\text{Hess}f(x_k)[\eta_k] = -\text{grad}f(x_k)$ by the truncated conjugate gradient (tCG) method. If $\text{Hess}f(x_k)$ is not sufficiently positive definite along the direction $d^{(i)}$ in the sense that $g_{x_k}(d^{(i)}, \text{Hess}f(x_k)[d^{(i)}])$ is sufficiently greater than 0, then the conjugate gradient is terminated, see Step 2 of Algorithm 2. This early termination guarantees that the output η_k is a sufficient descent direction, see Lemma 4.1. Moreover, the conjugate gradient method is terminated if the relative residual is sufficiently small in the sense that $\|r^{(i+1)}\|/\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|$ is smaller than the forcing term ϕ_k , see Step 5 of Algorithm 2. This condition not only reduces the computational cost by not requiring solving the Newton equation exactly but also ensures the local superlinear convergence rate of Algorithm (1), see Theorem 4.3. Since the Newton equation is defined on the Euclidean space $T_{x_k}\mathcal{M}$, Algorithm 2 is equivalent to the one in [DS83a, Minor Iteration].

Step 4 is used to find a step size satisfying inequalities (4.2) and (4.3), which is a Riemannian generalization of the line search conditions in [BN89]. It has been pointed out in [HAG18] that if the function f is radially L - C^1 function (see Definition 2.2), then many commonly-used line search conditions including the Wolfe conditions and Armijo-Glodstein conditions imply one or both of (4.2) and (4.3). Therefore, Algorithm 1 uses a weaker line search condition than the one in [DS83a].

4.2 Convergence Analysis

In this section, we establish the convergence results by merging the theoretical techniques in [DS83a] and [HAG18].

Theorem 4.1 generalizes the properties of the conjugate gradient method in [HS52] to a generic

Euclidean space. Such generalizations are trivial and have been used in [AMS08]. These results are given here for completeness and will be used in Lemma 4.1.

Theorem 4.1. *If $g_x(\text{Hess}f(x)[d_i], d_i) > \epsilon\delta_i$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$, then*

$$g_x(\text{Hess}f(x)[d_i], d_j) = 0, \quad i \neq j, \quad i, j = 0, 1, \dots, k, \quad (4.4)$$

$$g_x(d_i, r_j) = 0, \quad i < j, \quad i, j = 0, 1, \dots, k+1, \quad (4.5)$$

$$g_x(r_i, d_j) = g_x(r_j, r_j) = g_x(r_0, d_j), \quad i \leq j, \quad i, j = 0, 1, \dots, k, \quad (4.6)$$

$$\text{span}\{d_0, d_1, \dots, d_k\} = \text{span}\left\{g_x, \text{Hess}f(x)[g_x], \dots, (\text{Hess}f(x))^{k-1}[g_x]\right\}, \quad (4.7)$$

$$\varphi(\eta_{k+1}) = \min\{\varphi(\eta) : \eta \in \text{span}\{d_0, d_1, \dots, d_k\}\}, \quad (4.8)$$

$$\delta_i = g_x(d_i, d_i), \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, k, \quad (4.9)$$

where $\varphi(\eta_x) = f(x) + g_x(\text{grad}f(x), \eta_x) + \frac{1}{2}g_x(\text{Hess}f(x)[\eta_x], \eta_x)$, $\eta_x \in \mathbb{T}_x\mathcal{M}$.

Lemma 4.1 proves that the search direction η_k from Algorithm 2 is a descent direction and its norm is not small compared to the norm of $\text{grad}f(x_k)$. It is a Riemannian generalization of [DS83a, Lemma A.2]. Since η_k is a descent direction, there exists a step size satisfying Inequality (4.2) or (4.3) as shown in [NW06, HAG18]. Thus, Algorithm 1 is well-defined.

Lemma 4.1. *There exist two positive constants γ_1 and γ_2 that only rest with $\|\text{Hess}f(x_k)\|$ and ϵ respectively so that*

$$g_{x_k}(\text{grad}f(x_k), \eta_k) \leq -\gamma_1 \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|^2 \quad (4.10)$$

and

$$\|\eta_k\| \leq \gamma_2 \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|. \quad (4.11)$$

Proof. Out of convenience, use g_k , \mathcal{H}_k and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_k$ to denote $\text{grad}f(x_k)$, $\text{Hess}f(x_k)$ and $g_{x_k}(\cdot, \cdot)$. Suppose that $\eta_k = \eta^{(i)}$, $i \geq 0$. From Algorithm 2, we have

$$\eta_k = \eta^{(i)} = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \alpha^{(j)} d^{(j)}. \quad (4.12)$$

From Step 3 in Algorithm 2 and (4.6) we have that

$$\alpha^{(j)} = \frac{\langle d^{(j)}, r^{(0)} \rangle_k}{\langle d^{(j)}, q^{(j)} \rangle_k}. \quad (4.13)$$

Hence using (4.12) and (4.13) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \eta_k, g_k \rangle_k &= \langle \eta^{(i)}, -r^{(0)} \rangle_k = - \left\langle \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{\langle d^{(j)}, r^{(0)} \rangle_k}{\langle d^{(j)}, q^{(j)} \rangle_k} d^{(j)}, r^{(0)} \right\rangle_k = - \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{\langle d^{(j)}, r^{(0)} \rangle_k^2}{\langle d^{(j)}, q^{(j)} \rangle_k} \\ &\leq - \frac{\langle d^{(0)}, r^{(0)} \rangle_k^2}{\langle d^{(0)}, q^{(0)} \rangle_k} = - \frac{\langle d^{(0)}, d^{(0)} \rangle_k}{\langle d^{(0)}, \mathcal{H}_k[d^{(0)}] \rangle_k} \|g_k\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

with $d^{(0)} = r^{(0)} = -g_k$. By the Cauchy-Swartz inequality, we have

$$\frac{\langle d^{(0)}, d^{(0)} \rangle_k}{\langle d^{(0)}, \mathcal{H}_k[d^{(0)}] \rangle_k} \geq \frac{1}{\|\mathcal{H}_k\|} \geq \frac{1}{\gamma_1},$$

where $\gamma_1 > 0$ is a constant and the existence of γ_1 is guaranteed by the uniformly boundedness of \mathcal{H}_k from Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2. Therefore, inequality (4.10) holds. Note from (4.12) and (4.13) that

$$\eta^{(i)} = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{\langle d^{(j)}, r^{(0)} \rangle_k}{\langle d^{(j)}, q^{(j)} \rangle_k} d^{(j)}.$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\eta_k\| = \|\eta^{(i)}\| &= \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{\langle d^{(j)}, r^{(0)} \rangle_k}{\langle d^{(j)}, q^{(j)} \rangle_k} d^{(j)} \right\| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{|\langle d^{(j)}, r^{(0)} \rangle_k|}{\langle d^{(j)}, q^{(j)} \rangle_k} \|d^{(j)}\| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{\|d^{(j)}\| \|r^{(0)}\| \|d^{(j)}\|}{\langle d^{(j)}, q^{(j)} \rangle_k} = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{\|d^{(j)}\|^2}{\langle d^{(j)}, q^{(j)} \rangle_k} \|r^{(0)}\| \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{\langle d^{(j)}, d^{(j)} \rangle_k}{\langle d^{(j)}, q^{(j)} \rangle_k} \|r^{(0)}\| \leq i \frac{1}{\epsilon} \|r^{(0)}\| \\ &= i \frac{1}{\epsilon} \|g_k\|. \end{aligned}$$

So for $\gamma_2 = \max\{n\epsilon^{-1}, 1\}$, we have the desired result (4.11), where $n = \dim(\mathbb{T}_{x_k}\mathcal{M})$. \square

Now, we are ready to give the global convergence result of Algorithm 1 in Theorem 4.2. The proofs of Theorem 4.2 rely on the techniques in [HAG18], not the ones in [DS83a].

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\{x_n\}$ denote the sequence generated by Algorithm 1. Then it holds that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\text{grad}f(x_n)\| = 0.$$

If x^ is accumulation point of the sequence $\{x_k\}$ and $\text{Hess}f(x^*)$ is positive definite, then $x_k \rightarrow x^*$.*

Proof. Let $\{x_n\}$, $\{\eta_n\}$ be generated by Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 respectively and step sizes $\{\alpha_n\}$ satisfy either (4.2) or (4.3). Noting that (4.10) and (4.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \infty > f(x_0) - f(x_n) &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (f(x_k) - f(x_{k+1})) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (h_k(0) - h_k(\alpha_k)) \\ &\geq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \min \left(\chi_1 \frac{h'_k(0)^2}{\|\eta_k\|^2}, -\chi_2 h'_k(0) \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \min \left(\chi_1 \frac{g(\text{grad}f(x_k), \eta_k)^2}{\|\eta_k\|^2}, -\chi_2 g(\text{grad}f(x_k), \eta_k) \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \min \left(\chi_1 \gamma_1 \frac{\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|^2}{\|\eta_k\|^2} (-g(\text{grad}f(x_k), \eta_k)), -\chi_2 g(\text{grad}f(x_k), \eta_k) \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \min (\chi_1 \gamma_1 \gamma_2^{-2}, \chi_2) (-g(\text{grad}f(x_k), \eta_k)), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (-g(\text{grad}f(x_n), \eta_n)) = 0. \quad (4.14)$$

Combining (4.10) and (4.14) we have

$$0 \leq \gamma_1 \|\text{grad}f(x_n)\|^2 \leq (-g(\text{grad}f(x_n), \eta_n)) \rightarrow 0 \quad (n \rightarrow \infty).$$

For the second part, noting that $\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \rightarrow 0$ and continuity of $\text{grad}f$, any accumulation point \tilde{x} of the sequence $\{x_k\}$ is a stationary point of f . Under Assumption 4.2, each subsequence of $\{x_k\}$ converges to a stationary point. Therefore, $\{x_k\}$ converges to x^* since $\text{Hess}f(x^*)$ is positive definite. \square

The local convergence rate of Algorithm 1 is established in Theorem 4.3. The convergence rates are generalizations of the results in [DS83a]. However, the proofs are simply generalizations of [DS83a]. That the step size one eventually satisfies the line search condition is guaranteed by the Riemannian Dennis-Moré condition in [RW12]. The analysis of the order of convergence requires the relationship between multiple definitions of Riemannian gradients and Riemannian Hessians, i.e., $\text{grad}f(R_x(\eta_x))$ versus $\text{grad}(f \circ R_x)(\eta_x)$ and $\text{Hess}f(x_k)$ versus $\text{Hess}(f \circ R_x)(0_x)$.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\{x_k\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm 1 with forcing sequence $\phi_k = \min\{1/k, \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|^t\}$, $0 < t \leq 1$. Suppose that $\{x_k\}$ converges to x^* at which $\text{Hess}f(x^*)$ is positive definite and $\text{Hess}f(x)$ is continuous in a neighborhood of x^* . Then*

1. the stepsize $\alpha_k = 1$ is acceptable for sufficiently large k ; and
2. the convergence rate is superlinearⁱⁱ.

Moreover, suppose that $\text{Hess}\hat{f}$ satisfies that $\|\text{Hess}f(x_k) - \text{Hess}\hat{f}_{x_k}(0_{x_k})\| \leq \beta_1 \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|$, \hat{f} as defined in Definition 2.1, with a positive constant β_1 , and that $\text{Hess}\hat{f}_x$ is Lipschitz-continuous at 0_x uniformly in x in a neighborhood of x^* , i.e., there exist $\beta_2 > 0, \mu_1 > 0$ and $\mu_2 > 0$ such that for all $x \in B_{\mu_1}(x^*)$ and all $\eta_x \in B_{\mu_2}(0_x)$, it holds that $\|\text{Hess}\hat{f}_x(\eta_x) - \text{Hess}\hat{f}_x(0_x)\| \leq \beta_2 \|\eta_x\|$. Then,

3. the convergence rate is $1 + \min(1, t)$ ⁱⁱⁱ.

It is worth mentioning that in Theorem 4.3 the assumption “ $\|\text{Hess}f(x_k) - \text{Hess}\hat{f}_{x_k}(0_{x_k})\| \leq \beta_1 \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|$ ” [AMS08, Theorem 7.4.10] is reasonable since that for sufficiently large k , x_k is sufficiently close to x^* and the right-hand side can take zero at the stationary point x^* . On the other hand, if a second-order retraction is used, this assumption naturally holds since the right-hand side of the inequality can take up to zero [AMS08, Proposition 5.5.5]. The another assumption “ $\text{Hess}\hat{f}_x$ is Lipschitz-continuous at 0_x uniformly in x in a neighborhood of x^* ” [AMS08, Theorem 7.4.10] is the counterpart in the classical Newton-tCG method [DES82].

Proof. By Algorithm 2, we have

$$\|r_k\| = \|\text{Hess}f(x_k)[\eta_k] + \text{grad}f(x_k)\| \leq \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \phi_k \leq \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|^{1+t}. \quad (4.15)$$

ⁱⁱ A sequence $\{x_k\} \subset \mathcal{M}$ converging to $x^* \in \mathcal{M}$ is superlinear if $\frac{\text{dist}(x^*, x_{k+1})}{\text{dist}(x^*, x_k)} \rightarrow 0 (k \rightarrow \infty)$.

ⁱⁱⁱ A sequence $\{x_k\} \subset \mathcal{M}$ converging to $x^* \in \mathcal{M}$ has Q-order of $1 + \min(1, t)$ if $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{dist}(x^*, x_{k+1})}{\text{dist}(x^*, x_k)^{1+\min(1, t)}} < \infty$.

By the trigonometric inequality of norm and (4.15), we have

$$\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| - \|\text{Hess}f(x_k)[\eta_k]\| \leq \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|^{1+t}.$$

It continues

$$(1 - \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|^t)\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \leq \|\text{Hess}f(x_k)[\eta_k]\|.$$

By Assumption 4.1, there exist $L > 0, \tilde{L} > 0$ such that $\|\text{Hess}f(x_k)\| \leq L$ and $\|\text{Hess}f(x_k)^{-1}\| \leq \tilde{L}$ for sufficiently large k since $\text{Hess}f(x^*)$ is positive definite. it follows that

$$(1 - \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|^t)\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \leq L\|\eta_k\|.$$

By Theorem 4.2, for sufficiently large k , we have $\frac{1}{2}\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \leq L\|\eta_k\|$, that is,

$$\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\| \leq 2L\|\eta_k\|. \quad (4.16)$$

Besides, we have

$$\|\eta_k\| = \|\text{Hess}f(x_k)^{-1}[r_k - \text{grad}f(x_k)]\| \leq \tilde{L}(\|r_k\| + \|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|) \leq 2\tilde{L}\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|. \quad (4.17)$$

Thus, we have

$$\frac{\|\text{grad}f(x_k) + \text{Hess}f(x_k)\eta_k\|}{\|\eta_k\|} \leq \frac{\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|^{1+t}}{\|\eta_k\|} \leq (2L)^{1+t}\|\eta_k\|^t \leq (2L)^{1+t}\gamma_2^t\|\text{grad}f(x_k)\|^t,$$

which gives that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\text{grad}f(x_k) + \text{Hess}f(x_k)\eta_k\|}{\|\eta_k\|} = 0. \quad (4.18)$$

By [RW12, Proposition 5], (4.18) implies that for sufficiently large k , the step size $\alpha_k = 1$ is acceptable for Wolfe conditions and thus is too for (4.2) or (4.3) under Assumptions 4.1 and 4.3. In addition, the superlinear convergence rate is obtained by [RW12, Proposition 8].

By [AMS08, Lemma 7.4.8] and [AMS08, Lemma 7.4.9], there exist constants $c_0 > 0, c_1 > 0$ and $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$c_0 \text{dist}(x, x^*) \leq \|\text{grad}f(x)\| \leq c_1 \text{dist}(x, x^*), \quad \forall x \in B_{\mu_1}(x^*), \quad (4.19)$$

and

$$\|\text{grad}f(R_x(\eta_x))\| \leq c_2 \|\text{grad}\hat{f}_x(\eta_x)\|, \quad \forall x \in B_{\mu_1}(x^*), \quad \forall \eta_x \in B_{\mu_2}(0_x). \quad (4.20)$$

From the Taylor's formula for \hat{f}_{x_k} at 0_{x_k} , for sufficiently large k , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{grad}\hat{f}_{x_k}(\eta_k) &= \text{grad}\hat{f}_{x_k}(0_{x_k}) + \text{Hess}\hat{f}_{x_k}(0_{x_k})[\eta_k] + O(\|\eta_k\|^2) \\ &= \text{grad}f(x_k) + \text{Hess}f(x_k)[\eta_k] + (\text{Hess}\hat{f}_{x_k}(0_{x_k}) - \text{Hess}f(x_k))[\eta_k] + O(\|\eta_k\|^2) \\ &= r_k + (\text{Hess}\hat{f}_{x_k}(0_{x_k}) - \text{Hess}f(x_k))[\eta_k] + O(\|\eta_k\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

It, together with (4.15), (4.17), (4.19) and (4.20), implies that

$$\|\text{grad}f(x_{k+1})\| \leq c_2 \|\text{grad}\hat{f}_{x_k}(\eta_k)\|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq c_2 \|r_k\| + c_2 \|\text{Hess} \hat{f}_{x_k}(0_{x_k}) - \text{Hess} f(x_k)\| \|\eta_k\| + c_2 c_3 \|\eta_k\|^2 \\
&\leq c_2 \|r_k\| + c_2 (\beta_1 + c_3) \|\eta_k\|^2 \\
&\leq c_2 (\|\text{grad} f(x_k)\|^t + 4\tilde{L}^2 (\beta_1 + c_3) \|\text{grad} f(x_k)\|) \|\text{grad} f(x_k)\|,
\end{aligned}$$

where $c_3 > 0$ is a constant. Hence, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\text{dist}(x_{k+1}, x^*)}{\text{dist}(x_k, x^*)^{1+\min(1,t)}} &\leq \frac{c_1^{1+\min(1,t)}}{c_0} \frac{\|\text{grad} f(x_{k+1})\|}{\|\text{grad} f(x_k)\|^{1+\min(1,t)}} \\
&\leq \frac{c_2 c_1^{1+\min(1,t)}}{c_0} \left(\|\text{grad} f(x_k)\|^{t-\min(1,t)} + 4\tilde{L}^2 (\beta_1 + c_3) \|\text{grad} f(x_k)\|^{1-\min(1,t)} \right) \\
&\leq C,
\end{aligned}$$

for a constant $C > 0$, which completes the proof. \square

5 Riemannian Quotient Manifold $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$

In this section, the optimization tools of $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$ are reviewed, including tangent space, horizontal space, vertical space, Riemannian metric, retraction, Riemannian gradient, and Riemannian Hessian. The detailed derivations can be found in [ZHVZ23].

Vertical spaces. For any $Y \in \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$, it has been shown in [AMS08, Proposition 3.4.4] that the equivalence class $\pi^{-1}(\pi(Y))$ is an embedded submanifold $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$. The tangent space of $\pi^{-1}(\pi(Y))$ at Y is called the vertical space of $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$ at Y , denoted by V_Y , and is given by

$$V_Y = T_Y \pi^{-1}(\pi(Y)) = \{Y\Omega : \Omega \in \text{Skew}(p)\} \subseteq T_Y \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p},$$

where $\text{Skew}(p) = \{A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} : A^T = -A\}$.

Riemannian metrics on $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$. Three Riemannian metrics on $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$ given in [ZHVZ23] are considered here:

$$g_Y^i(\eta_Y, \xi_Y) = \begin{cases} 2\text{trace}(Y^T \eta_Y Y^T \xi_Y + Y^T Y \eta_Y^T \xi_Y) + \text{trace}(Y^T Y (\eta_Y^V)^T (\xi_Y^V)) & i = 1, \\ \text{trace}(Y^T Y \eta_Y^T \xi_Y) & i = 2, \\ \text{trace}(\eta_Y^T \xi_Y) & i = 3, \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

where $\eta_Y, \xi_Y \in T_Y \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} = \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, $\eta_Y^V = Y((Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T \eta_Y - \eta_Y^T Y (Y^T Y)^{-1}) / 2$, $\xi_Y^V = Y((Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T \xi_Y - \xi_Y^T Y (Y^T Y)^{-1}) / 2$. The Riemannian metric g_Y^1 is essentially equivalent to the Euclidean metric on $\mathcal{S}_+(p, n)$, see details in [ZHVZ23]; the Riemannian metric g_Y^2 has been used in [HGZ17], where the space under consideration is on the complex field; and the Riemannian metric g_Y^3 is the standard Euclidean inner product on $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and has been considered in [MA20].

Horizontal spaces. Given a Riemannian metric g on the total space $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$, the orthogonal complement space in $T_Y \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$ of V_Y with respect to g_Y is called the horizontal space at Y , denoted by H_Y . The horizontal spaces with respect to the three Riemannian metrics in (5.1) are respectively given by

$$H_Y^i = \begin{cases} \{YS + Y_\perp K : S^T = S, S \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}, K \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p) \times p}\} & i = 1, \\ \{YS + Y_\perp K : S^T = S, S \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}, K \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p) \times p}\} & i = 2, \\ \{Y(Y^T Y)^{-1}S + Y_\perp K : S^T = S, S \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}, K \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p) \times p}\} & i = 3. \end{cases}$$

By [AMS08, Section 3.5.8], the mapping $D\pi(Y)$ is a bijection from H_Y to $T_{\pi(Y)} \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$, so for each $\eta_{\pi(Y)} \in T_{\pi(Y)} \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$, there exists unique vector $\eta_Y \in H_Y$ such that $D\pi(Y)[\eta_Y] = \eta_{\pi(Y)}$. This η_Y is called the horizontal lift of $\eta_{\pi(Y)}$ at Y , denoted by $\eta_{\uparrow Y}$.

Projections onto Vertical Spaces and Horizontal Spaces. For any $Y \in \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$ and $\eta_Y \in T_Y \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$, the orthogonal projections of η_Y to V_Y and H_Y^i with respect to the first two metrics are respectively given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_Y^{V^i}(\eta_Y) &= Y\Omega, \text{ and } \mathcal{P}_Y^{H^i}(\eta_Y) = \eta_Y - \mathcal{P}_Y^{V^i}(\eta_Y) = \eta_Y - Y\Omega \\ &= Y \left(\frac{(Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T \eta_Y + \eta_Y^T Y (Y^T Y)^{-1}}{2} \right) + Y_\perp Y_\perp^T \eta_Y, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Omega = \frac{(Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T \eta_Y - \eta_Y^T Y (Y^T Y)^{-1}}{2}$. The orthogonal projections to vertical and horizontal spaces with respect to the third metric are

$$\mathcal{P}_Y^{V^3}(\eta_Y) = Y\Omega, \text{ and } \mathcal{P}_Y^{H^3}(\eta_Y) = \eta_Y - \mathcal{P}_Y^{V^3}(\eta_Y) = \eta_Y - Y\Omega,$$

where Ω is the skew-symmetric matrix satisfying $\Omega Y^T Y + Y^T Y \Omega = Y^T \eta_Y - \eta_Y^T Y$.

Riemannian metrics on $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$. If for all $\xi_{\pi(Y)}, \eta_{\pi(Y)} \in T_{\pi(Y)} \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$, it holds that

$$Y \sim Z \Rightarrow g_Y(\xi_{\uparrow Y}, \eta_{\uparrow Y}) = g_Z(\xi_{\uparrow Z}, \eta_{\uparrow Z}), \quad (5.2)$$

the Riemannian metric on $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$ induced by g is defined as $g_{\pi(Y)}(\xi_{\pi(Y)}, \eta_{\pi(Y)}) = g_Y(\xi_{\uparrow Y}, \eta_{\uparrow Y})$. Since the three Riemannian metrics g_Y^1, g_Y^2, g_Y^3 on $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$ satisfy (5.2) by [ZHVZ23], the corresponding three metrics on $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$ are given by:

$$g_{\pi(Y)}^i(\xi_{\pi(Y)}, \eta_{\pi(Y)}) = \begin{cases} 2\text{trace}(Y^T \xi_{\uparrow Y} Y^T \eta_{\uparrow Y} + Y^T Y \xi_{\uparrow Y}^T \eta_{\uparrow Y}) & i = 1, & (5.3a) \\ \text{trace}(Y^T Y \xi_{\uparrow Y}^T \eta_{\uparrow Y}) & i = 2, & (5.3b) \\ \text{trace}(\xi_{\uparrow Y}^T \eta_{\uparrow Y}) & i = 3, & (5.3c) \end{cases}$$

for all $\xi_{\pi(Y)}, \eta_{\pi(Y)} \in T_{\pi(Y)} \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$. In the following, with a slight abuse of notation, we use g^i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, to denote the Riemannian metrics on both $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$ and $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$.

Retraction. We choose the retraction on $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$ defined by

$$R_{\pi(Y)}(\xi_{\pi(Y)}) = \pi(Y + \xi_{\uparrow Y}), \quad (5.4)$$

where $Y \in \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p}$ and $\xi_{\pi(Y)} \in T_{\pi(Y)} \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$. Note that Retraction (5.4) has been used in [MA20, ZHVZ23].

The horizontal lifts of Riemannian Gradients and the actions of Riemannian Hessians. It follows from [ZHVZ23] that the Riemannian gradients and Riemannian Hessian of f in (3.2) can be characterized by the Euclidean gradient and the Euclidean Hessian of h in (3.1), see Proposition 5.1.

Proposition 5.1. *The Riemannian gradients of the smooth real-valued function f in (3.2) on $\mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$ with respect to the three Riemannian metrics are respectively given by*

$$(\text{grad} f(\pi(Y)))_{\uparrow Y} = \text{grad} \bar{f}(Y) = \begin{cases} (I - \frac{1}{2}Y(Y^T Y)^{-1}Y^T) \nabla h(Y Y^T) Y (Y^T Y)^{-1} & \text{under metric } g^1, \\ 2\nabla h(Y Y^T) Y (Y^T Y)^{-1} & \text{under metric } g^2, \\ 2\nabla h(Y Y^T) Y & \text{under metric } g^3, \end{cases}$$

and the actions of the Riemannian Hessians are respectively given by

$$(\text{Hess} f(\pi(Y))[\eta_{\pi(Y)}])_{\uparrow Y} = \begin{cases} \left(I - \frac{1}{2}P_Y \right) \nabla^2 h(Y Y^T) [Y \eta_{\uparrow Y}^T + \eta_{\uparrow Y} Y^T] Y (Y^T Y)^{-1} + T_1 & i = 1, \quad (5.5a) \\ 2\nabla^2 h(Y Y^T) [Y \eta_{\uparrow Y}^T + \eta_{\uparrow Y} Y^T] Y (Y^T Y)^{-1} + T_2 & i = 2, \quad (5.5b) \\ 2\nabla^2 h(Y Y^T) [Y \eta_{\uparrow Y}^T + \eta_{\uparrow Y} Y^T] Y + T_3 & i = 3, \quad (5.5c) \end{cases}$$

where $\nabla^2 h(Y Y^T)[V] = AVM + MVA$, $P_Y = Y(Y^T Y)^{-1}Y^T$, $T_1 = (I - P_Y)\nabla h(Y Y^T)(I - P_Y)\eta_{\uparrow Y}(Y^T Y)^{-1}$, $T_2 = \mathcal{P}_Y^{\text{H}^2} \{ \nabla h(Y Y^T) P_Y^\perp \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y)^{-1} + P_Y^\perp \nabla h(Y Y^T) \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y)^{-1} + 2\text{skew}(\eta_{\uparrow Y} Y^T) \cdot \nabla h(Y Y^T) Y (Y^T Y)^{-2} + 2\text{skew}\{\eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T \nabla h(Y Y^T)\} Y (Y^T Y)^{-1} \}$, and $T_3 = 2\mathcal{P}_Y^{\text{H}^3} \{ \nabla h(Y Y^T) \eta_{\uparrow Y} \}$.

6 Increasing Rank Algorithm and Preconditioning

6.1 Increasing Rank Algorithm

Algorithm 1 gives a low-rank approximation when the rank is known in advance. In practice, however, the rank of the exact solution X^* of Equation (1.1) is unknown beforehand. Therefore, we propose a rank-increasing algorithm, which solves Equation (1.1) with a low estimation of the rank. If the residual of the accumulation point is not sufficiently small, then the rank is increased and Problem (3.2) is solved by Algorithm 1 with an initial iterate motivated from the accumulation point of the lower rank. The details are stated in Algorithm 3 (IRRLyap).

Step 2 in Algorithm 3 can invoke Algorithm 1, which approximately solves Problem (3.2) with fixed rank p in the sense that the norm of gradient is reduced sufficiently, i.e., $\|\text{grad} f(\pi(Y_p))\| \leq \tau_p \|\text{grad} f(\pi(Y_p^{\text{initial}}))\|$. The tolerance sequence $\{\tau_p\}$ can be prescribed parameters or adaptively dependent on the current iterate.

Step 3 computes the relative residual r_p by following the steps in [VV10]. Note that the steps in [VV10] avoid the computations of the n -by- n matrices in the residual and only require $O(np^2)$ flops.

Algorithm 3 An Increasing Rank Riemannian Method for Lyapunov Equations (IRRLyap)

Input: minimum rank p_{\min} ; maximum rank p_{\max} ; rank increment p_{inc} ; initial iterate $Y_{p_{\min}}^{\text{initial}} \in \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p_{\min}}$; tolerance sequence of inner iteration $\{\tau_p : p \in \{p_{\min}, p_{\min} + p_{\text{inc}}, p_{\min} + 2p_{\text{inc}}, \dots, p_{\max}\}\}$; residual tolerance τ ;

Output: low-rank approximation \tilde{Y} ;

```

1: for  $p = p_{\min}, p_{\min} + p_{\text{inc}}, p_{\min} + 2p_{\text{inc}}, \dots, p_{\max}$  do
2:   Invoke an optimization algorithm, such as Algorithm 1, to approximately solve Problem
   (3.2) with the initial iterate  $\pi(Y_p^{\text{initial}})$  until the last iterate  $\pi(Y_p)$  satisfies  $\|\text{grad } f(\pi(Y_p))\| \leq$ 
    $\tau_p \|\text{grad } f(\pi(Y_p^{\text{initial}}))\|$ ;
3:   Compute relative residual of  $Y_p$ :  $r_p \leftarrow \|AY_p Y_p^T M + MY_p Y_p^T A - C\|_F / \|C\|_F$ ;
4:   if  $r_p \leq \tau$  then
5:     Return  $\tilde{Y} \leftarrow Y_p$ ;
6:   else
7:     Calculate the next initial iterate  $Y_{p+p_{\text{inc}}}^{\text{initial}}$  by performing one step of steepest descent on
      $[Y_p \ \mathbf{0}_{n \times p_{\text{inc}}}]$ ;
8:   end if
9: end for
10: Return  $\tilde{Y} \leftarrow Y_{p_{\max}}$ ;

```

Step 7 performs one step steepest descent with initial iterate $[Y_p \ \mathbf{0}_{n \times p_{\text{inc}}}]$ for minimizing the cost function $\tilde{f} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times (p+p_{\text{inc}})} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : Y \mapsto \text{trace}(Y^T A Y Y^T M Y) - \text{trace}(Y^T C Y)$. Since \tilde{f} is defined on the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{n \times (p+p_{\text{inc}})}$, the steepest descent algorithm can be defined at $[Y_p \ \mathbf{0}_{n \times p_{\text{inc}}}]$. In our implementation, the step size is found by the backtracking line search algorithm. Therefore, Algorithm 3 is a descent algorithm in the sense that the value of $h(Y_p Y_p^T) > h(Y_{p+p_{\text{inc}}} Y_{p+p_{\text{inc}}}^T)$.

6.2 Preconditioning

When the condition number of the Riemannian Hessian of f at the minimizer x^* is large and the sequence $\{x_k\}$ generated by Algorithm 1 converges to x^* , the number of iterations in the conjugate gradient method (Algorithm 2) can be large. To improve the efficiency, the preconditioned conjugate gradient method given in [NW06] is used. In this section, we derive preconditioners that approximate the inverse of the Riemannian Hessian with respect to the three Riemannian metrics.

6.2.1 Preconditioning under Riemannian Metric (5.3a)

The Newton direction is given by solving the Newton equation, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{find } \xi_{\pi(Y)} \in \mathbb{T}_{\pi(Y)} \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p \\ & \text{such that } \text{Hess } f(\pi(Y))[\xi_{\pi(Y)}] = -\text{grad } f(\pi(Y)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, when the Riemannian metric (5.3a) is used, Algorithm 1 needs to approximately solve

$$\left(I - \frac{1}{2}P_Y\right) \nabla^2 h(Y Y^T) [Y \xi_{\uparrow Y}^T + \xi_{\uparrow Y} Y^T] Y (Y^T Y)^{-1} + (I - P_Y) \nabla h(Y Y^T) (I - P_Y) \xi_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T)^{-1} = \eta_{\uparrow Y}, \quad (6.1)$$

for $\xi_{\uparrow Y} \in \mathbb{H}_Y^1$, where $\eta_{\uparrow Y} \in \mathbb{H}_Y^1$ denotes the horizontal lift of $-\text{grad } f(\pi(Y))$.

The preconditioner that we proposed aims to solve

$$\left(I - \frac{1}{2}P_Y\right) \nabla^2 h(Y Y^T) [Y \xi_{\uparrow Y}^T + \xi_{\uparrow Y} Y^T] Y (Y^T Y)^{-1} = \eta_{\uparrow Y}, \quad (6.2)$$

by omitting the second term in (6.1). Such an approximation is reasonable since (i) the second term is approximately zero if $Y_k Y_k^T \approx X^*$ and (ii) our numerical experiments show that this preconditioner effectively reduces the number of inner iterations.

Note that for any $Z \in \mathbb{T}_Y \mathbb{R}_*^{n \times p} = \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, there exist $W \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}, K \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p) \times p}$ such that $Z = YW + Y_{\perp M} K$, where $Y_{\perp M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-p)}$ satisfying $Y^T M Y_{\perp M} = 0$ and $Y_{\perp M}^T Y_{\perp M} = I_{n-p}$. Furthermore, we have $Z = Y \text{sym}(W) + Y \text{skew}(W) + Y_{\perp M} K$. Note that $Y \text{skew}(W) \in V_Y$, we have $Y (Y \text{skew}(W))^T + Y \text{skew}(W) Y^T = 0$, which implies the skew symmetric part of W does not affect the solution of (6.2). Next, we show an approach to find the solution of

$$\left(I - \frac{1}{2}P_Y\right) \nabla^2 h(Y Y^T) [Y \xi_Y^T + \xi_Y Y^T] Y (Y^T Y)^{-1} = \eta_{\uparrow Y}, \quad (6.3)$$

over the space $\{YS + Y_{\perp M} K \mid S \in \mathbb{S}_p^{\text{sym}}, K \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-p) \times p}\}$.

Multiplying (6.3) by $I + P_Y$ and $(Y^T Y)$ from left and right respectively yields

$$\nabla^2 h(Y Y^T) [Y \xi_Y^T + \xi_Y Y^T] Y = (I + P_Y) \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y). \quad (6.4)$$

It follows from (6.4) and the expression of $\nabla^2 h(Y Y^T)$ in Proposition 5.1 that

$$[A(Y \xi_Y^T + \xi_Y Y^T)M + M(Y \xi_Y^T + \xi_Y Y^T)A]Y = (I + P_Y) \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y). \quad (6.5)$$

Multiplying (6.5) from left by Y yields

$$\begin{aligned} Y^T A Y \xi_Y^T M Y + Y^T A \xi_Y Y^T M Y + Y^T M Y \xi_Y^T A Y + Y^T M \xi_Y Y^T A Y \\ = 2Y^T \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y) \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

and multiplying (6.5) from left by $Y_{\perp M}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\perp M}^T A Y \xi_Y^T M Y + Y_{\perp M}^T A \xi_Y Y^T M Y + Y_{\perp M}^T M \xi_Y Y^T A Y \\ = Y_{\perp M}^T (I + Y (Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T) \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y). \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

Plugging the decomposition $\xi_Y = Y S_{\xi} + Y_{\perp M} K_{\xi}$ into (6.6) and (6.7) respectively gives

$$\begin{aligned} 2Y^T A Y S_{\xi} Y^T M Y + Y^T A Y_{\perp M} K_{\xi} Y^T M Y + Y^T M Y K_{\xi}^T Y_{\perp M}^T A Y + 2Y^T M Y S_{\xi} Y^T A Y \\ = 2Y^T \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y), \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 2Y_{\perp M}^T A Y S_{\xi} Y^T M Y + Y_{\perp M}^T A Y_{\perp M} K_{\xi} Y^T M Y + Y_{\perp M}^T M Y_{\perp M} K_{\xi} Y^T A Y \\ = Y_{\perp M}^T (I + Y (Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T) \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y). \end{aligned} \quad (6.9)$$

Let $Z_{\xi} = Y_{\perp M} K_{\xi}$. We obtain from (6.9) that

$$Y_{\perp M}^T A Z_{\xi} Y^T M Y + Y_{\perp M}^T M Z_{\xi} Y^T A Y = Y_{\perp M}^T (I + Y (Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T) \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y) - 2Y_{\perp M}^T A Y S_{\xi} Y^T M Y.$$

Let $Y^T M Y = L L^T$ be the Cholesky factorization. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & Y_{\perp M}^T A Z_{\xi} L + Y_{\perp M}^T M Z_{\xi} L L^{-1} Y^T A Y L^{-T} \\ &= (Y_{\perp M}^T (I + Y(Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T) \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y) - 2 Y_{\perp M}^T A Y S_{\xi} Y^T M Y) L^{-T}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $L^{-1} Y^T A Y L^{-T} = Q \Lambda Q^T$ be the eigenvalue decomposition. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & Y_{\perp M}^T A Z_{\xi} L Q + Y_{\perp M}^T M Z_{\xi} L Q \Lambda \\ &= (Y_{\perp M}^T (I + Y(Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T) \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y) - 2 Y_{\perp M}^T A Y S_{\xi} Y^T M Y) L^{-T} Q. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{Z}_{\xi} = Z_{\xi} L Q$, then $Y^T M \tilde{Z}_{\xi} = Y^T M Y_{\perp M} K_{\xi} L Q = 0$ and we have

$$Y_{\perp M}^T A \tilde{Z}_{\xi} + Y_{\perp M}^T M \tilde{Z}_{\xi} \Lambda = (Y_{\perp M}^T (I + Y(Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T) \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y) - 2 Y_{\perp M}^T A Y S_{\xi} Y^T M Y) L^{-T} Q,$$

that is,

$$(I - \hat{V} \hat{V}^T) (A \tilde{Z}_{\xi} + M \tilde{Z}_{\xi} \Lambda) = (I - \hat{V} \hat{V}^T) ((I + Y(Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T) \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y) - 2 A Y S_{\xi} Y^T M Y) L^{-T} Q, \quad (6.10)$$

where $\hat{V} = \text{orthonormal}(M Y) = M Y G$. Using $\tilde{Z}_{\xi}(:, i)$ to denote the i -th column of \tilde{Z}_{ξ} , we have the saddle-point problems from (6.10) as follows

$$\begin{bmatrix} A + \lambda_i M & \hat{V} \\ \hat{V}^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{Z}_{\xi}(:, i) \\ y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} F_{\eta, \xi}(:, i) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (6.11)$$

where $\Lambda = \text{diag}\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p\}$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $F_{\eta, \xi} = (I - \hat{V} \hat{V}^T) ((I + Y(Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T) \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y) - 2 A Y S_{\xi} Y^T M Y) L^{-T} Q$, and the second equation holds due to $\hat{V}^T \tilde{Z}_{\xi} = G^T Y^T M Y_{\perp M} K_{\xi} L Q = 0$. Therefore, if we denote the solution of the i -th saddle-point problem, corresponding to (6.11), with right-hand side F by $\mathcal{T}_i^{-1}(F)$, then (6.11) can be write as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Z}_{\xi}(:, i) &= \mathcal{T}_i^{-1} \left((I - \hat{V} \hat{V}^T) (I + Y(Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T) \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y) L^{-1} Q(:, i) \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{T}_i^{-1} \left((I - \hat{V} \hat{V}^T) 2 A Y \right) L^{-T} Q \tilde{S}_{\xi}(:, i), \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

where $\tilde{S}_{\xi} = Q^T L^T S_{\xi} L Q$.

Plugging $\tilde{S}_{\xi} = Q^T L^T S_{\xi} L Q$ into (6.6), we obtain

$$2 \Lambda \tilde{S}_{\xi} + 2 \tilde{S}_{\xi} \Lambda + Q^T L^{-1} Y^T A \tilde{Z}_{\xi} + \tilde{Z}_{\xi}^T A Y L^{-T} Q = 2 Q^T L^{-1} Y^T \eta_Y (Y^T Y) L^{-T} Q. \quad (6.13)$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} v_i &= Q^T L^{-1} Y^T A \mathcal{T}_i^{-1} \left((I - \hat{V} \hat{V}^T) (I + Y(Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T) \eta_Y (Y^T Y) L^{-T} Q(:, i) \right), \\ w_i &= Q^T L^{-1} Y^T A \mathcal{T}_i^{-1} \left((I - \hat{V} \hat{V}^T) 2 A Y L^{-T} Q \right) \tilde{S}_{\xi}(:, i). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (6.13) that

$$2 \Lambda \tilde{S}_{\xi} + 2 \tilde{S}_{\xi} \Lambda + [v_1 - w_1 \quad \dots \quad v_k - w_k] + \begin{bmatrix} (v_1 - w_1)^T \\ \dots \\ (v_k - w_k)^T \end{bmatrix} = 2 Q^T L^{-1} Y^T \eta_Y (Y^T Y) L^{-T} Q,$$

that is,

$$(\mathcal{K} + \Pi\mathcal{K}\Pi)\text{vec}(\tilde{S}_\xi) = \text{vec}(R), \quad (6.14)$$

where $\mathcal{K} = \text{diag}(K_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{p^2 \times p^2}$, $K_i = 2\lambda_i I - Q^T L^{-1} Y^T A \mathcal{T}_i^{-1} \left((I - \hat{V} \hat{V}^T) 2AYL^{-T} Q \right)$, Π is the perfect shuttle matrix [Loa00] such that $\text{vec}(X) = \Pi \text{vec}(X)^T$ and $R = 2Q^T L^{-1} Y^T \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y) L^{-T} Q - [v_1, \dots, v_k] - [v_1, \dots, v_k]^T$. To sum up, after solving (6.14), we obtain \tilde{Z}_ξ from (6.12). Therefore, the solution ξ_Y of (6.3) is obtained.

Since $\xi_Y = \mathcal{P}_Y^{\text{V}^1}(\xi_Y) + \mathcal{P}_Y^{\text{H}^1}(\xi_Y)$ and $\mathcal{P}_Y^{\text{V}^1}(\xi_Y)$ does not influence the left hand side of (6.3) because of $Y(\mathcal{P}_Y^{\text{V}^1}(\xi_Y))^T + \mathcal{P}_Y^{\text{V}^1}(\xi_Y)Y^T = 0$, the solution to (6.2) is $\xi_{\uparrow Y} = \mathcal{P}_Y^{\text{H}^1}(\xi_Y)$. The final algorithm for solving (6.2) is stated in Algorithm 4.

Algorithm 4 Preconditioner under Riemannian metric (5.3a)

Input: Matrices A and M and horizontal vector $\eta_{\uparrow Y} \in \mathbb{H}_Y^1$;

Output: $\xi_{\uparrow Y}$ satisfying (6.5);

- 1: Set $LL^T \leftarrow Y^T M Y$ (Cholesky factorization);
- 2: Set $Q\Lambda Q^T \leftarrow L^{-1} Y^T A Y L^{-T}$ (Eigenvalues decomposition);
- 3: Set $\hat{V} \leftarrow \text{orthonormal}(MY)$;
- 4: Set $v_i \leftarrow Q^T L^{-1} Y^T A \mathcal{T}_i^{-1} \left((I - \hat{V} \hat{V}^T) (I + Y(Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T) \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y) L^{-T} Q(:, i) \right)$;
- 5: Set $K_i \leftarrow 2\lambda_i I - Q^T L^{-1} Y^T A \mathcal{T}_i^{-1} \left((I - \hat{V} \hat{V}^T) 2AYL^{-T} Q \right)$;
- 6: Set $R \leftarrow 2Q^T L^{-1} Y^T \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y) L^{-T} Q - [v_1, \dots, v_k] - [v_1, \dots, v_k]^T$;
- 7: Solve for \tilde{S}_ξ by $(\mathcal{K} + \Pi\mathcal{K}\Pi)\text{vec}(\tilde{S}_\xi) = \text{vec}(R)$;
- 8: Solve for \tilde{Z}_ξ by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Z}_\xi(:, i) &\leftarrow \mathcal{T}_i^{-1} \left((I - \hat{V} \hat{V}^T) (I + Y(Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T) \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y) L^{-1} Q(:, i) \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{T}_i^{-1} \left((I - \hat{V} \hat{V}^T) 2AY \right) L^{-T} Q \tilde{S}_\xi(:, i); \end{aligned}$$

- 9: Set $Z_{\xi,1} \leftarrow \frac{1}{2} Y \left((Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T \tilde{Z}_\xi Q^T L^{-1} + L^{-T} Q \tilde{Z}_\xi^T Y (Y^T Y)^{-1} \right)$;
 - 10: Set $Z_{\xi,2} \leftarrow (I - Y(Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T) \tilde{Z}_\xi Q^T L^{-1}$;
 - 11: Set $\xi_{\uparrow Y} \leftarrow Y L^{-T} Q \tilde{S}_\xi Q^T L^{-1} + Z_{\xi,1} + Z_{\xi,2}$.
-

For applying this preconditioner, the dominating costs lie in solving the saddle-point problems and solving the linear system (6.14). As for the saddle-point problems (6.11), we firstly can solve $\mathcal{T}_i(X_i) = B_i$ by eliminating the (negative) Schur complement $S_i = \hat{V}^T (A + \lambda_i M)^{-1} \hat{V}$ (see [BGL05] for details), where

$$B_i = [(I - \hat{V} \hat{V}^T) (I + Y(Y^T Y)^{-1} Y^T) \eta_{\uparrow Y} (Y^T Y)^{-1} L^{-1} Q(:, i), (I - \hat{V} \hat{V}^T) 2AYL^{-1} Q].$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} v_i &= Q^T L^{-1} Y^T A X_i(:, 1), \\ K_i &= 2\lambda_i I - Q^T L^{-1} Y^T A J_i(:, 2 : \text{end}), \end{aligned}$$

where $N_i = S_i^{-1} (\hat{V}^T (A + \lambda_i M)^{-1} B_i)$ and $J_i = (A + \lambda_i M)^{-1} B_i - (A + \lambda_i M)^{-1} \hat{V} N_i$. The linear system (6.14) therefore can be solved by the conjugate gradient method.

6.2.2 Preconditioning under Riemannian Metrics (5.3b) and (5.3c)

Similar to the approach in Section 6.2.1, the preconditioners for Riemannian metrics (5.3b) and (5.3c) respectively solves the equations

$$[A(Y\xi_{\uparrow Y}^T + \xi_{\uparrow Y}Y^T)M + M(Y\xi_{\uparrow Y}^T + \xi_{\uparrow Y}Y^T)A]Y = \eta_{\uparrow Y}(Y^TY), \text{ for } \xi_{\uparrow Y} \in \mathbb{H}_Y^2 \quad (6.15)$$

and

$$2[A(Y\xi_{\uparrow Y}^T + \xi_{\uparrow Y}Y^T)M + M(Y\xi_{\uparrow Y}^T + \xi_{\uparrow Y}Y^T)A]Y = \eta_{\uparrow Y}, \text{ for } \xi_{\uparrow Y} \in \mathbb{H}_Y^3. \quad (6.16)$$

The derivations are analogous to those in Section 6.2.1 and therefore are not repeated here. The algorithms for solving (6.15) and (6.16) are respectively stated in Algorithm 5 and Algorithm 6. Note that in Step 9 and 10 of Algorithm 6, two small-scale Sylvester equations of size $p \times p$ need be solved and can be done by using *lyap* function in MATLAB.

Algorithm 5 Preconditioner under Riemannian metric (5.3b)

Input: Matrices A and M and horizontal vector $\eta_{\uparrow Y} \in \mathbb{H}_Y^2$;

Output: $\xi_{\uparrow Y}$ satisfying (6.15);

- 1: Set $LL^T \leftarrow Y^TMY$ (Cholesky factorization);
- 2: Set $Q\Lambda Q^T \leftarrow L^{-1}Y^TAYL^{-T}$ (Eigenvalues decomposition);
- 3: Set $\hat{V} \leftarrow \text{orthonormal}(MY)$;
- 4: Set $v_i \leftarrow Q^TL^{-1}Y^TAT_i^{-1} \left((I - \hat{V}\hat{V}^T)\frac{1}{2}\eta_{\uparrow Y}(Y^TY)L^{-T}Q(:, i) \right)$;
- 5: Set $K_i \leftarrow 2\lambda_i I - Q^TL^{-1}Y^TAT_i^{-1} \left((I - \hat{V}\hat{V}^T)2AYL^{-T}Q \right)$;
- 6: Set $R \leftarrow \frac{1}{2}Q^TL^{-1}Y^T\eta_{\uparrow Y}(Y^TY)L^{-T}Q - [v_1, \dots, v_k] - [v_1, \dots, v_k]^T$;
- 7: Solve for \tilde{S}_ξ by $(\mathcal{K} + \Pi\mathcal{K}\Pi)\text{vec}(\tilde{S}_\xi) = \text{vec}(R)$;
- 8: Solve for \tilde{Z}_ξ by

$$\tilde{Z}_\xi(:, i) \leftarrow \mathcal{T}_i^{-1} \left((I - \hat{V}\hat{V}^T)\frac{1}{2}\eta_{\uparrow Y}(Y^TY)L^{-1}Q(:, i) \right) - \mathcal{T}_i^{-1} \left((I - \hat{V}\hat{V}^T)2AYL^{-T}Q \right) \tilde{S}_\xi(:, i);$$

- 9: Set $Z_{\xi,1} \leftarrow \frac{1}{2}Y \left((Y^TY)^{-1}Y^T\tilde{Z}_\xi Q^TL^{-1} + L^{-T}Q\tilde{Z}_\xi^TY(Y^TY)^{-1} \right)$;
 - 10: Set $Z_{\xi,2} \leftarrow (I - Y(Y^TY)^{-1}Y^T)\tilde{Z}_\xi Q^TL^{-1}$;
 - 11: Set $\xi_{\uparrow Y} \leftarrow YL^{-T}Q\tilde{S}_\xi Q^TL^{-1} + Z_{\xi,1} + Z_{\xi,2}$.
-

7 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we illustrate the performance of the proposed algorithms with three examples. In the first example, we explore the influence of the three considered Riemannian metrics on Algorithm 1 and demonstrate the gain of the proposed preconditioners for Algorithm 2. In the second example, we investigate the quality of the solutions of Algorithm 3 compared with some state-of-the-art low-rank methods. In the third example, we report on the performance of Algorithm 3 compared to three state-of-the-art low-rank methods for Lyapunov equations.

Algorithm 6 Preconditioner under Riemannian metric (5.3c)

Input: Matrices A and M and horizontal vector $\eta_{\uparrow Y} \in \mathbb{H}_Y^3$;

Output: $\xi_{\uparrow Y}$ satisfying (6.16);

- 1: Set $LL^T \leftarrow Y^TMY$ (Cholesky factorization);
- 2: Set $Q\Lambda Q^T \leftarrow L^{-1}Y^TAYL^{-T}$ (Eigenvalues decomposition);
- 3: Set $\hat{V} \leftarrow \text{orthonormal}(MY)$;
- 4: Set $v_i \leftarrow Q^TL^{-1}Y^TAT_i^{-1} \left((I - \hat{V}\hat{V}^T)\frac{1}{2}\eta_{\uparrow Y}L^{-T}Q(:, i) \right)$;
- 5: Set $K_i \leftarrow 2\lambda_i I - Q^TL^{-1}Y^TAT_i^{-1} \left((I - \hat{V}\hat{V}^T)2AYL^{-T}Q \right)$;
- 6: Set $R \leftarrow \frac{1}{2}Q^TL^{-1}Y^T\eta_{\uparrow Y}L^{-T}Q - [v_1, \dots, v_k] - [v_1, \dots, v_k]^T$;
- 7: Solve for \tilde{S}_ξ by $(\mathcal{K} + \Pi\mathcal{K}\Pi)\text{vec}(\tilde{S}_\xi) = \text{vec}(R)$;
- 8: Solve for \tilde{Z}_ξ by

$$\tilde{Z}_\xi(:, i) \leftarrow \mathcal{T}_i^{-1} \left((I - \hat{V}\hat{V}^T)\frac{1}{2}\eta_{\uparrow Y}L^{-1}Q(:, i) \right) - \mathcal{T}_i^{-1} \left((I - \hat{V}\hat{V}^T)2AYL^{-T}Q \right) \tilde{S}_\xi(:, i);$$

- 9: Solve for S_ξ by $S_\xi(Y^TY)^{-1} + (Y^TY)^{-1}S_\xi = 2L^{-T}Q\tilde{S}_\xi Q^TL^{-1}$;
 - 10: Solve for Ω by $\Omega Y^TY + Y^TY\Omega = Y^T\tilde{Z}_\xi Q^TL^{-1} - L^{-T}Q\tilde{Z}_\xi^TY$;
 - 11: Set $\xi_{\uparrow Y} \leftarrow Y(Y^TY)^{-1}S_\xi + \tilde{Z}_\xi Q^TL^{-1} - Y\Omega$.
-

7.1 Testing Environment, Data, and Parameter Settings

All experiments are done in MATLAB R2021b on a 64-bit GNU/Linux platform with 2.10 GHz CPU (Intel Xeon Gold 5318Y). The Riemannian optimization methods used in this paper are implemented based on ROPTLIB [HAGH18].

In the first example, we generate two data, by randomly constructing and discretizing the finite difference of $2D$ poisson problem on the square, as listed respectively in Listing 1 and Listing 2. In remaining two examples, the generalized Lyapunov equation is drawn from a RAIL benchmark problem^{iv} stemmed from a semidiscretized heat transfer problem for optimal cooling of steel profiles [BS05, SB04].

The elements of the initial iterate Y_0 are drawn from the standard normal distribution. In Algorithm 1, the step sizes satisfy the Armijo-Goldstein conditions and are found by interpolation-based backtracking algorithm [DS83b]. The default parameters in ROPTLIB are used. In Algorithm 3, the tolerance for the inner iteration is chosen adaptively by $\tau_p = \min(10^{-6}, r_p/10)$.

Listing 1: random data

```
O = orth(randn(n, n)); D = diag(logspace(-2, 2, n) .* (0.5 + rand(1, n)));
A = O' * D * O;
O = orth(randn(n, n)); D = diag(logspace(0, 0.5, n));
M = O' * D * O;
c = randn(n, 1);
C = c * c';
```

Listing 2: the finite difference discretized $2D$ poisson problem on the square

```
h = 1 / (n + 1);
```

^{iv}The data are available at https://www.cise.ufl.edu/research/sparse/matrices/list_by_id.html with different dimensions.

```

A = 1 / (h * h) * spdiags(ones(n, 1) * [-1 2 1], [-1 0 1], n, n)
M = spdiags([rand(n - 1, 1); 0] + 0.1 , 0, n, n);
c = randn(n, 1);
C = c * c';

```

7.2 Influence of Metrics and Preconditioners

Algorithm 1 is tested on random data generated from Listing 1 with 20 random seeds and also on the designed data generated from Listing 2 with 20 random seeds. The results are reported in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1: An average result of 20 random runnings under three metrics. Indices are explained as follows: “success”, “iter”, “nf”, “ng”, “nH”, “time” and “gfgf0” respectively refer to the number of successes in 20 runnings in the sense that “gfgf0” is not greater than the tolerance, the number of iterations, the number of evaluation of cost, the number of computing gradient, the number of the action of Hessian, the running time and the norm of final gradient over the norm of initial gradient. The subscript $-k$ indicates a scale of 10^{-k} .

RNewton	$n = 500, p = 2$						$n = 1000, p = 2$					
	non-preconditioner			preconditioner			non-preconditioner			preconditioner		
	metric 1	metric 2	metric 3	metric 1	metric 2	metric 3	metric 1	metric 2	metric 3	metric 1	metric 2	metric 3
success	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
iter	43	71	45	21	26	21	43	65	40	18	29	19
nf	53	84	54	24	29	25	52	79	48	21	34	22
ng	44	72	46	22	27	22	44	66	41	19	30	20
nH	2361	2140	3576	57	339	206	2611	2307	3515	46	413	219
time	3.56	3.28	5.27	1.21	7.15	4.37	1.35 ₁	1.20 ₁	1.79 ₁	5.09	4.16 ₁	2.18 ₁
gfgf0	3.00 ₋₉	3.97 ₋₉	4.12 ₋₉	2.11 ₋₉	4.50 ₋₉	3.39 ₋₉	3.40 ₋₉	2.48 ₋₉	4.39 ₋₉	1.41 ₋₉	4.64 ₋₉	4.05 ₋₉

From Table 1, we can see that in most cases, Algorithm 1 under Metric g^1 requires the least number of iterations, and the corresponding number of function calculations and gradient calls are also the least. When the preconditioners are not used, Algorithm 1 calls Hessian least under Metric g^2 , followed by Metric g^1 , and most under Metric g^3 , which is consistent with the total running time. If the preconditioners are used, the situation is quite different. Specifically, the number of Hessian calls (nH) in Algorithm 1 is greatly reduced under the three metrics, that is, “nH” decreased at least by 97%, 82%, and 93% compared with the ones without preconditioners under Metric g^1 , g^2 , and g^3 respectively. Though the numbers of actions of Hessian evaluations are reduced significantly, the computational times may not be reduced due to the extra cost of the preconditioners. Among the three metrics, only the preconditioner of Metric g^1 reduces the computational time significantly.

Table 2: An average result of 20 runnings on designed data under three metrics. The subscript $-k$ indicates a scale of 10^{-k} .

RNewton	$n = 4000, p = 3$						$n = 40000, p = 3$					
	non-preconditioner			preconditioner			non-preconditioner			preconditioner		
	metric 1	metric 2	metric 3	metric 1	metric 2	metric 3	metric 1	metric 2	metric 3	metric 1	metric 2	metric 3
success	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	18	20	20	20
iter	13	41	53	2	8	6	10	35	63	1	7	5
nf	15	49	67	3	9	7	12	43	80	2	8	6
ng	14	42	54	3	9	7	11	36	64	2	8	6
nH	723	602	287	2	22	9	550	536	314	1	16	6
time	1.07	9.50 ₋₁	4.24 ₋₁	1.75 ₋₂	1.70 ₋₁	6.43 ₋₂	7.96	7.67	3.94	6.98 ₋₂	9.89 ₋₁	3.33 ₋₁
gfgf0	8.03 ₋₉	8.00 ₋₉	7.78 ₋₉	7.04 ₋₉	6.97 ₋₉	4.43 ₋₉	6.30 ₋₉	7.32 ₋₉	4.53 ₋₉	1.02 ₋₁₀	3.65 ₋₉	2.56 ₋₉

Table 2 shows that when the preconditioners are not used, the running time and “nH” under Metric g^3 is the least, which is different from the results in Table 1. However, for $n = 4000$, Algorithm 1 under Metric g^3 only ran successfully 18 times, which indicates that its robustness is weaker than the rest two. Note that the preconditioner with Metric g^1 outperforms all the other combinations of preconditioners and metrics. Moreover, such a combination only requires one or two iterations. One of the reasons may be that the preconditioner of Metric g^1 approximates the linear system (1.1) well such that the next iterate is close to the solution.

Overall, it is observed from Table 1 and Table 2 that Algorithm 1 with the preconditioner under Metric g^1 is mostly superior to the other two metrics. Therefore, in the following experiments, only Metric g^1 is considered.

7.3 Comparison with Existing Low-Rank Methods

In this section, Algorithm 3, called LRRLayp, is compared with three existing state-of-the-art low-rank methods for Lyapunov equations, including K-PIK from [Sim07], mess_lradi from M-M.E.S.S, a MATLAB toolbox [SKB22], and RLayp from [VV10]. These methods are respectively based on Krylov subspace techniques, alternating direction implicit iterative, and Riemannian optimization. Since, in Algorithm 3, other Riemannian methods can be used to solve the subproblem, we further use the Riemannian trust-region Newton method in [ABG07] and the resulting algorithm is denoted by IRRLyap-RTRNewton. Algorithm 3 with Algorithm 1 is denoted by IRRLyap-RNewton. As a reference, the notation “best low rank” with rank p denotes a best low-rank approximation by the truncated singular value decomposition to the exact solution of (1.1).

Quality of low-rank solutions. The generalized Lyapunov equation was drawn from a RAIL benchmark problem with the coefficient matrix of size $n = 1357$. For the sake of simplicity, the right-hand side is taken as $C = B(:, 1)B(:, 1)^T$. Figure 1 shows the experiment results.




Figure 1: The relative residual for one-rank right-hand-side RAIL benchmark with $n = 1357$.

Let us compare the performance of the tested methods with the reference method—“best low rank”. It can be seen from Figure 1 that under the same rank, the relative residuals of the low-rank approximations from K-PIK and mess_lradi are notably greater than those from “best low rank”. Therefore, mess_lradi and K-PIK are not preferred if lower-rank solutions are desired. When the

relative residual is greater than 10^{-6} , that is, highly accurate solutions are not needed, the solutions from IRRLyap-RTRNewton and IRRLyap-RNewton are close in the sense of the relative residual. This is because IRRLyap-RTRNewton and IRRLyap-RNewton solve the same optimization problem. However, when the relative residual is smaller than 10^{-6} , the relative residuals from IRRLyap-RTRNewton begin to fluctuate without falling. We find that for this problem, RTRNewton is more sensitive to numerical error than RNewton in the sense that RTRNewton sometimes terminates before reaching the stopping criterion. Such behavior of RTRNewton prevents it from finding highly accurate solutions. Therefore, we conclude that IRRLyap-RNewton is preferable compared to IRRLyap-RTRNewton. The solutions found by IRRLyap-RNewton even have smaller relative residuals than those from “best low rank”. This is not surprising since “best low rank” uses truncated SVD and completely ignore the original problem whereas IRRLyap-RNewton aims to find a stationary point, i.e., minimizes the Riemannian gradient—the residual in the horizontal space, see Proposition 5.1. Overall, IRRLyap-RNewton is able to find the best solution compared to the tested methods in the sense of the relative residual.

Efficiency and performance. K-PIK, mess_lradi, RLyap, and IRRLyap-RNewton are compared by using the RAIL benchmark problems with size $n = 5177, 20209, 79841$. The stopping criterion for all methods are unified as $\|R\|_F = \|AXM + MXA - C\|_F \leq \tau \cdot \|C\|_F$ with a tolerance $\tau = 10^{-6}$. The results are reported in Table 3.

Table 3: Comparison for the simplified RAIL benchmark with existing methods. “rank”, “time”, “rel_res” and “numSys” denote the rank of the approximation, running time, the relative residual of the approximation and the number of solving shift systems $(A + \lambda M)X = B$ for X with given A, λ, M and B . The subscript $-k$ indicates a scale of 10^{-k} .

	$n = 5177$				$n = 20209$				$n = 79841$			
	rank	times(s.)	rel_res	numSys	rank	times(s.)	rel_res	numSys	rank	times(s.)	rel_res	numSys
K-PIK	63	3.41	1.46 ₋₆	64	91	4.44 ₁	2.65 ₋₆	92	122	5.06 ₂	4.39 ₋₆	123
mess_lradi	32	1.57 ₋₁	1.47 ₋₇	64	37	8.65 ₋₁	5.90 ₋₇	74	38	3.85	6.12 ₋₈	76
RLyap	22	1.42 ₂	4.92 ₋₇	15784	27	1.06 ₃	2.25 ₋₇	23060	27	6.09 ₃	8.58 ₋₇	29481
IRRLyap(RNewton)	22	5.70	6.94 ₋₇	588	27	4.29 ₁	3.38 ₋₇	841	27	2.56 ₂	5.10 ₋₇	1100

All the methods stop by satisfying the stopping criterion except K-PIK. Therefore, K-PIK has difficulty finding highly accurate solutions. Moreover, K-PIK needs to use a higher rank to reach a similar residual compared to other methods. Therefore, K-PIK is not preferred. The method mess_lradi is the most efficient algorithm in the sense of computational time. However, it also requires a higher rank for similar accuracy when compared to RLyap and LRRLyap-RNewton. Thus, mess_lradi is preferred if one has strict requirements on efficiency but not on rank. Both RLyap and IRRLyap-RNewton are Riemannian optimization approaches and therefore the ranks and residuals of solutions found by them are similar. However, the preconditioner used in RLyap does not take $M \neq I$ into consideration. It follows that RLyap requires solving more shift systems and therefore is less efficient. Overall, we suggest using IRRLyap-RNewton if one does not have strict restrictions on efficiency and desires as low-rank solutions as possible.

A hybrid method. Since mess_lradi is significantly faster than IRRLyap-RNewton but gives a lower quality solution in the sense of the residual. We, therefore, propose a hybrid method by first using mess_lradi to generate a rough solution and improving its accuracy by IRRLyap-RNewton. The hybrid method is denoted by lradi_IRRLyap and the comparisons with IRRLyap-RNewton

are given in Table 4. It can be seen that lradi-IRRLyap is a method between mess_lradi and IRRLyap-RNewton in the sense that its computational time is smaller than IRRLyap-RNewton and its rank is smaller than mess_lradi.

Table 4: Comparisons for the simplified RAIL benchmark among mess_lradi, lradi-IRRLyap, and IRRLyap-RNewton. The subscript $-k$ indicates a scale of 10^{-k} .

	$n = 5177$				$n = 20209$				$n = 79841$			
	rank	times(s.)	rel_res	numSys	rank	times(s.)	rel_res	numSys	rank	times(s.)	rel_res	numSys
mess_lradi	32	1.57 ₋₁	1.47 ₋₇	64	37	8.65 ₋₁	5.90 ₋₇	74	38	3.85	6.12 ₋₈	76
lradi-IRRLyap	26	2.41	6.31 ₋₇	156	32	7.18	2.28 ₋₇	96	32	1.18 ₂	8.05 ₋₇	384
IRRLyap-RNewton	22	5.70	6.94 ₋₇	588	27	4.29 ₁	3.38 ₋₇	841	27	2.56 ₂	5.10 ₋₇	1100

8 Conclusions

In this paper, we have generalized the truncated Newton’s method from Euclidean spaces to Riemannian manifolds, called Riemannian truncated-Newton’s method, and shown the convergence results, e.g., global convergence and local superlinear convergence. Moreover, the cost function from [VV10] is reformulated as an optimization problem defined on the Riemannian quotient manifold $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$. An algorithm, called IRRLyap-RNewton, is proposed and is used to find a low-rank approximation of the generalized Lyapunov equations. We investigate three Riemannian metrics on $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p} / \mathcal{O}_p$ and develop new preconditioners that take $M \neq I$ into consideration. The numerical results show that the new preconditioners significantly reduce the number of actions of Riemannian Hessian evaluations even when $M \neq I$. In addition, IRRLyap-RNewton is able to find a similar accurate solution with the lowest rank compared to some state-of-the-art methods, including K-PIK, mess_lradi, and RLyap.

References

- [ABG07] P.-A. Absil, C.G. Baker, and K.A. Gallivan. Trust-region methods on Riemannian manifolds. Foundations of Computational Mathematics, 7:303–330, 2007.
- [AMS08] P.-A. Absil, Robert Mahony, and Rodolphe Sepulchre. Optimization algorithms on matrix manifolds. Princeton University Press, 2008.
- [Ant05] Athanasios C. Antoulas. Approximation of large-scale dynamical systems. In Advances in Design and Control, 2005.
- [Bau08] Ulrike Baur. Low rank solution of data-sparse Sylvester equations. Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications, 15:837–851, 2008.
- [BB06] Ulrike Baur and Peter Benner. Factorized solution of Lyapunov equations based on hierarchical matrix arithmetic. Computing, 78(3):211–234, 2006.
- [BGL05] Michele Benzi, Gene H. Golub, and Jörg Liesen. Numerical solution of saddle point problems. Acta Numerica, 14:1–137, 2005.

- [BHW21] Peter Benner, Jan Heiland, and Steffen W. R. Werner. A low-rank solution method for Riccati equations with indefinite quadratic terms. Numerical Algorithms, 92:1083–1103, 2021.
- [BK14] Peter Benner and Patrick Kürschner. Computing real low-rank solutions of Sylvester equations by the factored ADI method. Computers and Mathematics with Applications, 67(9):1656–1672, 2014.
- [BLT09] Peter Benner, Ren-Cang Li, and Ninoslav Truhar. On the ADI method for Sylvester equations. Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics, 233(4):1035–1045, 2009.
- [BM03] Samuel Burer and Renato D.C. Monteiro. A nonlinear programming algorithm for solving semidefinite programs via low-rank factorization. Mathematical Programming, 95(2):329–357, 2003.
- [BN89] Richard H. Byrd and Jorge Nocedal. A tool for the analysis of quasi-Newton methods with application to unconstrained minimization. SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 26:727–739, 1989.
- [Boo75] W. M. Boothby. An introduction to differentiable manifolds and Riemannian geometry. volume 63 of Pure and Applied Mathematics. Elsevier, 1975.
- [Bou20] Nicolas Boumal. An introduction to optimization on smooth manifolds. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [BPS22] Peter Benner, Davide Palitta, and Jens Saak. On an integrated Krylov-ADI solver for large-scale Lyapunov equations. Numerical Algorithms, 92(1):35–63, 2022.
- [BS72] R. H. Bartels and G. W. Stewart. Algorithm 432 [c2]: Solution of the matrix equation $AX + XB = C$ [f4]. Communications of the ACM, 15(9):820–826, 1972.
- [BS05] Peter Benner and Jens Saak. A semi-discretized heat transfer model for optimal cooling of steel profiles. In Dimension Reduction of Large-Scale Systems, pages 353–356. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005.
- [Chu87] King-wah Eric Chu. The solution of the matrix equations $AXB-CXD=E$ and $(YA-DZ, YC-BZ)=(E, F)$. Linear Algebra and its Applications, 93:93–105, 1987.
- [dABFF22] Márcio Antônio de Andrade Bortoloti, Teles A. Fernandes, and Orizon Pereira Ferreira. An efficient damped Newton-type algorithm with globalization strategy on Riemannian manifolds. Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics, 403(3):113853, 2022.
- [dABFFY18] Márcio Antônio de Andrade Bortoloti, Teles A. Fernandes, Orizon Pereira Ferreira, and Jinyun Yuan. Damped Newton’s method on Riemannian manifolds. Journal of Global Optimization, 77(3):643–660, 2018.
- [DES82] Ron S. Dembo, Stanley C. Eisenstat, and Trond Steihaug. Inexact Newton methods. SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 19(2):400–408, 1982.

- [DS83a] Ron S. Dembo and Trond Steihaug. Truncated-Newton algorithms for large-scale unconstrained optimization. Mathematical Programming, 26(2):190–212, 1983.
- [DS83b] John E. Dennis and Bobby Schnabel. Numerical methods for unconstrained optimization and nonlinear equations. In Prentice Hall series in computational mathematics, 1983.
- [DS11] Vladimir Druskin and Valeria Simoncini. Adaptive rational Krylov subspaces for large-scale dynamical systems. Systems and Control Letters, 60:546–560, 2011.
- [GDA⁺20] Bhawna Goyal, Ayush Dogra, Sunil Agrawal, B. S. Sohi, and Apoorav Sharma. Image denoising review: From classical to state-of-the-art approaches. Information Fusion, 55:220–244, 2020.
- [GGB22] Ion Victor Gosea, Serkan Gugercin, and Christopher Beattie. Data-driven balancing of linear dynamical systems. SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 44(1):A554–A582, 2022.
- [GL96] Gene H. Golub and Charles Van Loan. Matrix computations (3rd ed.). 1996.
- [GNVL79] G. Golub, S. Nash, and C. Van Loan. A Hessenberg-Schur method for the problem $AX + XB = C$. IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 24(6):909–913, 1979.
- [Gra04] Lars Grasedyck. Existence of a low rank or H-matrix approximant to the solution of a Sylvester equation. Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications, 11:371–389, 2004.
- [GSA03] S. Gugercin, D.C. Sorensen, and A.C. Antoulas. A modified low-rank Smith method for large-scale Lyapunov equations. Numerical Algorithms, 32(1):27–55, 2003.
- [HAG15] Wen Huang, Pierre-Antoine Absil, and Kyle A. Gallivan. A Riemannian symmetric rank-one trust-region method. Mathematical Programming, 150:179–216, 2015.
- [HAG18] Wen Huang, P.-A. Absil, and K. A. Gallivan. A Riemannian BFGS method without differentiated retraction for nonconvex optimization problems. SIAM Journal on Optimization, 28(1):470–495, 2018.
- [HAGH18] Wen Huang, P.-A. Absil, Kyle A. Gallivan, and Paul Hand. ROPTLIB: An object-oriented C++ library for optimization on Riemannian manifolds. ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software, 44(4), jul 2018.
- [Ham82] S. J. Hammarling. Numerical solution of the stable, non-negative definite Lyapunov equation. SIMA Journal of Numerical Analysis, 2(3):303–323, 07 1982.
- [HG22] Wen Huang and Kyle A. Gallivan. A limited-memory Riemannian symmetric rank-one trust-region method with a restart strategy. Journal of Scientific Computing, 93(1), 2022.
- [HGA15] Wen Huang, Kyle A. Gallivan, and Pierre-Antoine Absil. A Broyden class of quasi-Newton methods for Riemannian optimization. SIAM Journal on Optimization, 25:1660–1685, 2015.

- [HGZ17] Wen Huang, K. A. Gallivan, and Xiangxiong Zhang. Solving PhaseLift by low-rank Riemannian optimization methods for complex semidefinite constraints. SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 39(5):B840–B859, 2017.
- [HJR21] Majed Hamadi, Khalide Jbilou, and Ahmed Ratnani. A model reduction method in large scale dynamical systems using an extended-rational block Arnoldi method. Journal of Applied Mathematics and Computing, 68:271–293, 2021.
- [HS52] Magnus R. Hestenes and Eduard Stiefel. Methods of conjugate gradients for solving linear systems. Journal of research of the National Bureau of Standards, 49:409–435, 1952.
- [HS95] Uwe Helmke and Mark A. Shayman. Critical points of matrix least squares distance functions. Linear Algebra and its Applications, 215:1–19, 1995.
- [IP18] Bruno Iannazzo and Margherita Porcelli. The Riemannian Barzilai–Borwein method with nonmonotone line search and the matrix geometric mean computation. Ima Journal of Numerical Analysis, 38:495–517, 2018.
- [J96] Lucas Jódar. Lyapunov matrix equation in system stability and control (Zoran Gajic and Muhammad Tahir Javed Qureshi). SIAM Review, 38(4):691–691, 1996.
- [Loa00] Charles F. Van Loan. The ubiquitous Kronecker product. Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics, 123(1):85–100, 2000.
- [LW04] Jing-Rebecca Li and Jacob White. Low-rank solution of Lyapunov equations. SIAM Review, 46(4):693–713, 2004.
- [MA20] Estelle Massart and P.-A. Absil. Quotient geometry with simple geodesics for the manifold of fixed-rank positive-semidefinite matrices. SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications, 41(1):171–198, 2020.
- [Moo81] Bradley Alan Moore. Principal component analysis in linear systems: Controllability, observability, and model reduction. IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 26:17–32, 1981.
- [MV14] B. Mishra and B. Vandereycken. A Riemannian approach to low-rank algebraic Riccati equations, 2014.
- [NW06] Jorge Nocedal and Stephen J. Wright. Numerical optimization. Springer series in operations research. Springer, 2nd ed edition, 2006.
- [Pen98] Thilo Penzl. Numerical solution of generalized Lyapunov equations. Advances in Computational Mathematics, 8(1):33–48, 1998.
- [Pen00] Thilo Penzl. Eigenvalue decay bounds for solutions of Lyapunov equations: the symmetric case. Systems and Control Letters, 40(2):139–144, 2000.
- [PS16] Davide Palitta and Valeria Simoncini. Matrix-equation-based strategies for convection–diffusion equations. BIT Numerical Mathematics, 56(2):751–776, 2016.

- [RW12] Wolfgang Ring and Benedikt Wirth. Optimization methods on Riemannian manifolds and their application to shape space. SIAM Journal on Optimization, 22(2):596–627, 2012.
- [Sat16] Hiroyuki Sato. A Dai–Yuan-type Riemannian conjugate gradient method with the weak Wolfe conditions. Computational Optimization and Applications, 64(1):101–118, 2016.
- [SB04] Jens Saak and Peter Benner. Efficient numerical solution of the LQR-problem for the heat equation. Proceedings in Applied Mathematics and Mechanics, 4(1), 2004.
- [SI15] Hiroyuki Sato and Toshihiro Iwai. A new, globally convergent Riemannian conjugate gradient method. Optimization, 64(4):1011–1031, 2015.
- [Sim07] V. Simoncini. A new iterative method for solving large-scale Lyapunov matrix equations. SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 29(3):1268–1288, 2007.
- [SKB22] J. Saak, M. Köhler, and P. Benner. M-M.E.S.S.-2.1 – the matrix equations sparse solvers library, February 2022. see also: <https://www.mpi-magdeburg.mpg.de/projects/mess>.
- [SVdVR08] Wil Schilders, Henk Van der Vorst, and Joost Rommes. Model Order Reduction: Theory, Research Aspects and Applications, volume 13. 2008.
- [VV10] Bart Vandereycken and Stefan Vandewalle. A Riemannian optimization approach for computing low-rank solutions of Lyapunov equations. SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications, 31(5):2553–2579, 2010.
- [WZB20] Yang Wang, Zhi Zhao, and Zhengjian Bai. Riemannian Newton-CG methods for constructing a positive doubly stochastic matrix from spectral data*. Inverse Problems, 36(11):115006, 2020.
- [ZBJ18] Zhi Zhao, Zhengjian Bai, and Xiaoqing Jin. A Riemannian inexact Newton-CG method for constructing a nonnegative matrix with prescribed realizable spectrum. Numerische Mathematik, 140:827–855, 2018.
- [Zhu17] Xiaojing Zhu. A Riemannian conjugate gradient method for optimization on the Stiefel manifold. Computational Optimization and Applications, 67:73–110, 2017.
- [ZHVZ23] Shixin Zheng, Wen Huang, Bart Vandereycken, and Xiangxiong Zhang. Riemannian optimization using three different metrics for hermitian PSD fixed-rank constraints: an extended version, 2023.