

Error Analysis of Randomized Symplectic Model Order Reduction for Hamiltonian systems

R. Herkert, P. Buchfink, B. Haasdonk, J. Rettberg, J. Fehr

May 20, 2024

Abstract

Solving high-dimensional dynamical systems in multi-query or real-time applications requires efficient surrogate modelling techniques, as e.g., achieved via model order reduction (MOR). If these systems are Hamiltonian systems their physical structure should be preserved during the reduction, which can be ensured by applying symplectic basis generation techniques such as the complex SVD (cSVD). Recently, randomized symplectic methods such as the randomized complex singular value decomposition (rcSVD) have been developed for a more efficient computation of symplectic bases that preserve the Hamiltonian structure during MOR. In the current paper, we present two error bounds for the rcSVD basis depending on the choice of hyperparameters and show that with a proper choice of hyperparameters, the projection error of rcSVD is at most a constant factor worse than the projection error of cSVD. We provide numerical experiments that demonstrate the efficiency of randomized symplectic basis generation and compare the bounds numerically.

Keywords: Symplectic Model Order Reduction, Hamiltonian Systems, Randomized Algorithm, Error Analysis

MSC codes: 15A52, 65G99, 65P10, 68W20, 93A15

1 Introduction

On the one hand, classical simulation methods rely on simulation models based on physical principles. On the other hand, data-based modelling techniques using machine learning are becoming increasingly popular. Current trends tend to merge those principles by enriching the physics-based models with data and to include physical prior knowledge in data-based models. In the context of model order reduction (MOR) such a fusion of physics and data-based modelling can be realized by snapshot-based (physical) structure-preserving MOR. One way to model physical systems while guaranteeing conservation principles, is using the framework of Hamiltonian systems which are for example often used in mechanics, optics, quantum mechanics or theoretical chemistry. The mathematical structure of this kind of systems ensures conservation of the Hamiltonian (which can be understood as the energy contained in the system) and under certain assumptions stability properties [1]. These simulation models may be of large scale especially in real-world applications as they may arise from spatially discretized PDEs. Therefore, in multi-query or real-time applications efficient surrogate modelling techniques, e.g., achieved via MOR are required. However, classical data-based MOR via the Proper Orthogonal Decomposition (POD) [2] does not necessarily preserve the Hamiltonian structure in the reduced order model (ROM) which could lead to unphysical models that may violate conservation properties and could become unstable. Therefore, it is necessary to ensure the preservation of the

Hamiltonian structure by the applied MOR technique. This can be accomplished by symplectic MOR where the system is projected to a low-dimensional, symplectic subspace [3, 4, 5]. For low-dimensional problems, a symplectic matrix can be computed by numerically solving the proper symplectic decomposition (PSD) optimization problem [5]. For high-dimensional problems numerically solving the optimization problem is not feasible and other techniques have to be used to construct a reduced basis. A popular method to compute a symplectic basis is the complex singular value decomposition (cSVD) [5]. This technique involves computing a low-rank matrix approximation, which can also result in high computational costs in the offline-phase. Randomized approaches for computing low-rank matrix factorization [6, 7, 8, 9] are a promising way to lower this computational effort while preserving a high approximation quality compared to classical methods. Randomized techniques can be used to solve various numerical linear algebra problems more efficiently, such as the computation of a determinant [10], Gram–Schmidt orthonormalization [11], the computation of an eigenvalue decomposition or an SVD [6], rank estimation [12], the computation of a LU decomposition [13], or the computation of a generalized LU decomposition [14]. In the context of MOR the capability of randomized algorithms has been shown by applying randomization for more efficient basis generation [15, 16, 17]. In [18] the concept of randomized basis generation is merged with ideas from domain decomposition. Random sketching techniques have further been used for computing parameter-dependent preconditioners [19] or for approximating a ROM by its random sketch [20, 21]. In [22] time-dependent problems are treated by constructing randomized local approximation spaces in time. While none of these approaches guarantees to preserve a Hamiltonian structure, in [23] we presented randomized techniques for symplectic basis generation and reported initial encouraging numerical experiments. The scope of the current work is to improve the methods presented there and give a theoretical foundation by mathematical error analysis. Our key contributions are:

1. We prove that the randomized complex SVD (rcSVD) [23] is quasi-optimal in the set of symplectic matrices with orthonormal columns.
2. We present an error bound depending on the hyperparameters which yields a better understanding of the method and better intuition on how to choose the hyperparameters depending on the problem.
3. We show how the rcSVD algorithm can be reformulated into a version that works only with real matrices.

Our paper is structured as follows: An introduction to structure-preserving MOR is given in Section 2. In Section 3, we prove quasi-optimality for the rcSVD in the set of symplectic bases with orthonormal columns. Section 4 analyzes the influence of power iterations and present an error bound depending on the hyperparameters. We present a formulation of the cSVD algorithm based on real numbers in Section 5. In Section 6, we show numerical experiments that demonstrate the computational efficiency of randomized symplectic basis generation and compare the bounds numerically. The work is concluded in Section 7.

2 Structure-Preserving MOR

In this section, we give an introduction to both, classical structure-preserving, symplectic MOR and randomized structure-preserving, symplectic MOR using the randomized complex SVD.

2.1 Hamiltonian Systems and Symplectic MOR

We start with an overview on Hamiltonian systems and structure-preserving, symplectic MOR for parametric high-dimensional Hamiltonian systems. For a more detailed introduction, we refer to [24, 25, 26] (MOR), [27] (symplectic geometry and Hamiltonian systems) and [5] (symplectic MOR of Hamiltonian systems).

We assume to be given a *parametric Hamiltonian (function)* $\mathcal{H}(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^{2N}, \mathbb{R})$, depending on a parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}$ with parameter set $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ and a parameter-dependent initial value $\boldsymbol{x}_0(\boldsymbol{\mu})$. Then, the parametric Hamiltonian system reads: For a given time interval $I_t = [t_0, t_{\text{end}}]$ and fixed (but arbitrary) parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}$, find the solution $\boldsymbol{x}(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathcal{C}^1(I_t, \mathbb{R}^{2N})$ of

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \boldsymbol{x}(t; \boldsymbol{\mu}) &= \mathbb{J}_{2N} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} \mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{x}(t; \boldsymbol{\mu}); \boldsymbol{\mu}) \quad \text{for all } t \in I_t, \\ \boldsymbol{x}(t_0; \boldsymbol{\mu}) &= \boldsymbol{x}_0(\boldsymbol{\mu}). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

with *canonical Poisson matrix*

$$\mathbb{J}_{2N} := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_N & \mathbf{I}_N \\ -\mathbf{I}_N & \mathbf{0}_N \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times 2N},$$

where $\mathbf{I}_N, \mathbf{0}_N \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ denote the identity and zero matrix. In some cases it is convenient to split the solution $\boldsymbol{x}(t; \boldsymbol{\mu}) = [\boldsymbol{q}(t; \boldsymbol{\mu}); \boldsymbol{p}(t; \boldsymbol{\mu})]$ in separate coordinates $\boldsymbol{q}(t; \boldsymbol{\mu}), \boldsymbol{p}(t; \boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ which are referred to as the generalized position \boldsymbol{q} and generalized momentum \boldsymbol{p} . Note that here and in the following we use MATLAB-style notation for matrix indexing and stacking. One important property of a Hamiltonian system is that the solution preserves the Hamiltonian over time, i.e., $\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{x}(t; \boldsymbol{\mu}); \boldsymbol{\mu}) = 0$ for all $t \in I_t$.

Symplectic MOR [4, 5] is a projection-based MOR technique to reduce parametric high-dimensional Hamiltonian systems. It essentially consists of constructing a suitable symplectic reduced basis matrix $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times 2k}$ which is then used for projecting the full-order system to a reduced surrogate. It results in a ROM that is a low-dimensional Hamiltonian system with a *reduced Hamiltonian* $\mathcal{H}_r(\boldsymbol{x}_r) := \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{V} \boldsymbol{x}_r)$. This is obtained by (i) the ROB matrix $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times 2k}$ being a *symplectic matrix* i.e.,

$$\mathbf{V}^\top \mathbb{J}_{2N} \mathbf{V} = \mathbb{J}_{2k}$$

and (ii) setting the projection matrix $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times 2k}$ as the transpose of the so-called *symplectic inverse* $\mathbf{V}^+ \in \mathbb{R}^{2k \times 2N}$ of the ROB matrix \mathbf{V} , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{W}^\top := \mathbf{V}^+ := \mathbb{J}_{2k} \mathbf{V}^\top \mathbb{J}_{2N}^\top.$$

Then, the reduced parametric Hamiltonian system reads: For a fixed (but arbitrary) parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}$, find the solution $\boldsymbol{x}_r(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathcal{C}^1(I_t, \mathbb{R}^{2k})$ of

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \boldsymbol{x}_r(t; \boldsymbol{\mu}) &= \mathbb{J}_{2k} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}_r} \mathcal{H}_r(\boldsymbol{x}_r(t; \boldsymbol{\mu}); \boldsymbol{\mu}) \quad \text{for all } t \in I_t, \\ \boldsymbol{x}_r(t_0; \boldsymbol{\mu}) &= \mathbf{V}^+ \boldsymbol{x}_0(\boldsymbol{\mu}). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

2.2 Symplectic basis generation using the complex SVD (cSVD)

In this section, we present the symplectic basis generation technique complex SVD (cSVD). Consider the snapshot matrix $\mathbf{X}_s := [\boldsymbol{x}_1^s, \dots, \boldsymbol{x}_{n_s}^s] \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times n_s}$ with $\boldsymbol{x}_i^s \in \mathcal{M}, i = 1, \dots, n_s$ where \mathcal{M} denotes the set of all solutions

$$\mathcal{M} := \{\boldsymbol{x}(t; \boldsymbol{\mu}) \mid (t, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \in I_t \times \mathcal{P}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{2N}.$$

Next, \mathbf{X}_s is split into $\mathbf{X}_s = [\mathbf{Q}_s; \mathbf{P}_s]$, with $\mathbf{Q}_s, \mathbf{P}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n_s}$. The main idea of the cSVD algorithm is to compute a truncated SVD of the complex snapshot matrix $\mathbf{U}_c \Sigma_c \mathbf{V}_c^H \approx \mathbf{X}_c := \mathbf{Q}_s + i\mathbf{P}_s \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times n_s}$. Then, the matrix $\mathbf{U}_c \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times k}$ is split into real and imaginary part $\mathbf{U}_c = \mathbf{V}_Q + i\mathbf{V}_P$, with $\mathbf{V}_Q, \mathbf{V}_P \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times k}$ and mapped to

$$\mathbf{V}_{\text{cSVD}} := \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{U}_c) := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{V}_Q & -\mathbf{V}_P \\ \mathbf{V}_P & \mathbf{V}_Q \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times 2k}.$$

With this mapping \mathcal{A} , a complex matrix with orthonormal columns is mapped from the complex Stiefel manifold $V_k(\mathbb{C}^N)$ to a real symplectic matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{2N \times 2k}$, i.e., $\mathcal{A} : V_k(\mathbb{C}^N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2N \times 2k}$ [5]. The symplectic cSVD basis matrix \mathbf{V}_{cSVD} and its symplectic inverse $\mathbf{V}_{\text{cSVD}}^+$ are then used to construct the ROM. In [3] it has been shown that the cSVD procedure yields the optimal symplectic basis in the set of ortho-symplectic matrices (i.e., symplectic with orthonormal columns). Furthermore, every ortho-symplectic matrix $\mathbf{V}_E \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times 2k}$ has the block structure $\mathbf{V}_E = [\mathbf{E}, \mathbb{J}_{2N}\mathbf{E}]$ where $\mathbf{E} \in V_k(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Therefore, general ortho-symplectic matrices will in the following be denoted with \mathbf{V}_E . The procedure is summarized as Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Complex SVD (cSVD)

Input: Snapshot matrix $\mathbf{X}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times n_s}$, target size $2k \in \mathbb{N}$ of the ROB,

Output: Symplectic ROB matrix $\mathbf{V}_{\text{cSVD}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times 2k}$

- 1: $\mathbf{X}_c = \mathbf{X}_s(1 : N, :) + i\mathbf{X}_s((N + 1) : (2N), :)$ ▷ complex snapshot matrix
 - 2: $[\mathbf{U}_c, \Sigma_c, \mathbf{V}_c] = \text{SVD}(\mathbf{X}_c)$ ▷ basis for approximation of \mathbf{X}_c
 - 3: $\mathbf{U}_{c(k)} = \mathbf{U}_c(:, 1 : k)$ ▷ truncate to rank- k basis
 - 4: $\mathbf{V}_Q = \text{Re}(\mathbf{U}_{c(k)}), \mathbf{V}_P = \text{Im}(\mathbf{U}_{c(k)})$ ▷ split in real and imaginary part
 - 5: $\mathbf{V}_{\text{cSVD}} = [\mathbf{V}_Q, -\mathbf{V}_P; \mathbf{V}_P, \mathbf{V}_Q]$ ▷ map to symplectic matrix
-

2.3 Symplectic basis generation using the randomized complex SVD

In this section, we present a brief summary on randomized matrix factorizations and a refined version of the randomized complex SVD (rcSVD) algorithm from [23]. In the following we focus on the randomized SVD. Similar techniques can be applied to other types of factorizations. We refer to [6] for a more detailed presentation on randomized matrix factorization. In this section, we use general notation for the matrix sizes m, n as the results are more general than only covering our case from the previous section. In the context of Hamiltonian systems, we later will use $m = N$ and $n = n_s$. The computation of a randomized SVD of a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ proceeds in two stages. First, using random sampling methods [6], a matrix $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times k}$, with $k \leq m$ and $k \leq n$ with orthonormal columns is computed that approximates $\mathbf{A} \approx \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H\mathbf{A}$. To obtain this, a so-called random sketch $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Omega} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times k}$ is computed where the sketching matrix $\boldsymbol{\Omega} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times k}$ is drawn from some random distribution (e.g. an elementwise normal distribution). Then, the columns of \mathbf{Y} are orthonormalized to form the matrix \mathbf{Q} . Based on the approximation of \mathbf{A} by $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H\mathbf{A}$, a randomized version of the SVD can be formulated: With the definition $\mathbf{B} := \mathbf{Q}^H\mathbf{A}$, its SVD is $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{U}_B \Sigma_B \mathbf{V}_B^H$ and by setting $\mathbf{U} := \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{U}_B$ we get the randomized SVD $\mathbf{A} \approx \mathbf{U}\Sigma_B \mathbf{V}_B^H$. The fact that \mathbf{U} has orthonormal columns follows by its definition as a product of two of such matrices. Instead of using a sketching matrix of target rank k , it is known that the approximation quality can be improved by introducing an oversampling parameter p_{ovs} and aiming for $l := k + p_{\text{ovs}}$ columns for $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ [6] (see step 2 in Algorithm 2), and truncate to a rank- k basis (see steps 5, 6, 7 in Algorithm 2). The method can be further improved by applying power iterations. This means that for $q_{\text{pow}} \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

the random sketch is computed as $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{q_{\text{pow}}} \boldsymbol{\Omega}$. Especially for matrices whose singular values decay slowly this can be useful. A computational advantage in comparison with a direct factorization of \mathbf{B} will be achievable if $l \ll n$ and $l \ll m$. This procedure is particularly efficient when using a special random sketching matrix such as the subsampled randomized Fourier transform (SRFT) [6] that allows the multiplication $\mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ to be performed in $\mathcal{O}(mn \log(l))$ flops.

Definition 1. An SRFT is an $n \times l$ matrix of the form

$$\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \sqrt{\frac{n}{l}} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{F} \mathbf{R},$$

with

1. $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ diagonal, with diagonal entries that are independent random variables uniformly distributed on the complex unit circle,
2. $\mathbf{F} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ a unitary discrete Fourier transform (DFT) and
3. $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times l}$ selection matrix where its columns are drawn randomly without replacement from the columns of the identity matrix \mathbf{I}_n .

In order to apply randomization to symplectic basis generation, the idea of the rcSVD algorithm is to replace the computation of the truncated SVD of \mathbf{X}_c with a randomized rank- k approximation of the complex snapshot matrix \mathbf{X}_c . The procedure is summarized as Algorithm 2. In comparison with the original algorithm in [23], the truncation step is refined via the computation of an additional SVD of a small matrix (see Algorithm 2 steps 5, 6, 7). This improves the approximation quality and is also necessary for the mathematical analysis presented in the next section which does not work for the original version of the method.

Algorithm 2 Randomized Complex SVD (rcSVD)

- Input:** Snapshot matrix $\mathbf{X}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times n_s}$, target rank $2k \in \mathbb{N}$ of the ROB, oversampling parameter $p_{\text{ovs}} \in \mathbb{N}_0$, power iteration number $q_{\text{pow}} \in \mathbb{N}_0$
- Output:** Symplectic ROB matrix $\mathbf{V}_{\text{rcSVD}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times 2k}$
- 1: $\mathbf{X}_c = \mathbf{X}_s(1 : N, :) + i\mathbf{X}_s((N + 1) : (2N), :)$ ▷ complex snapshot matrix
 - 2: $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \text{SRFT}(n_s, l)$, with $l := k + p_{\text{ovs}}$ ▷ draw a random sketching matrix
 - 3: $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}_c (\mathbf{X}_c^H \mathbf{X}_c)^{q_{\text{pow}}} \boldsymbol{\Omega}$
 - 4: $[\mathbf{U}_Y, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_Y, \mathbf{V}_Y] = \text{SVD}(\mathbf{Y})$ ▷ basis for approximation of \mathbf{Y}
 - 5: $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{U}_Y^H \mathbf{X}_c$
 - 6: $[\mathbf{U}_B, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B, \mathbf{V}_B] = \text{SVD}(\mathbf{B})$ ▷ basis for approximation of \mathbf{B}
 - 7: $\mathbf{U}_c^r = \mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_B(:, 1 : k)$ ▷ truncate to rank- k basis
 - 8: $\mathbf{V}_Q = \text{Re}(\mathbf{U}_c^r)$, $\mathbf{V}_P = \text{Im}(\mathbf{U}_c^r)$ ▷ split in real and imaginary part
 - 9: $\mathbf{V}_{\text{rcSVD}} = [\mathbf{V}_Q, -\mathbf{V}_P; \mathbf{V}_P, \mathbf{V}_Q]$ ▷ map to symplectic matrix
-

3 Quasi-optimality for the rcSVD in the set of ortho-symplectic matrices

In [3] it has been shown that the cSVD algorithm [5] yields an optimal solution of the PSD in the set of ortho-symplectic bases. I.e., for $\mathbf{X}_s = [\mathbf{P}; \mathbf{Q}] \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times n_s}$, $\mathbf{V}_{\text{cSVD}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times 2k}$ it holds that

$$\min_{\mathbf{V}_E \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times 2k} \text{ ortho-symplectic}} \|\mathbf{X}_s - \mathbf{V}_E \mathbf{V}_E^T \mathbf{X}_s\|_F^2 = \|\mathbf{X}_s - \mathbf{V}_{\text{cSVD}} \mathbf{V}_{\text{cSVD}}^T \mathbf{X}_s\|_F^2 \quad (3)$$

with projection error

$$\|\mathbf{X}_s - \mathbf{V}_{\text{cSVD}} \mathbf{V}_{\text{cSVD}}^T \mathbf{X}_s\|_F^2 = \sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2, \quad (4)$$

where $\sigma_j, j = 1, \dots, n_s$ denote the singular values of the complex snapshot matrix $\mathbf{X}_c = \mathbf{Q} + i\mathbf{P}$. In the following, we show that the rcSVD procedure (see Algorithm 2) is quasi-optimal in the set of ortho-symplectic matrices. Before doing so, we recall some results from [28] on structured random matrices. The first one states a bound on the smallest singular value of a matrix resulting from randomly sampling rows from a matrix with orthonormal columns. It is a slight reformulation of [28, Lemma 3.2] and therefore, we omit the proof.

Lemma 1 (Row sampling [28]). *Consider a matrix $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times k}$ with orthonormal columns, and define the quantity $M := n \max_{j=1, \dots, n} \|\mathbf{e}_j^T \mathbf{W}\|_2^2$ where \mathbf{e}_j denotes the j -th unit vector. For a positive parameter α , select the sample size l with $\alpha M \log(k) \leq l \leq n$. Draw a random subset T of size l from $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and define the matrix $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times l}$ by stacking the corresponding unit vectors as column vectors (see Definition 1). Then, for $\delta \in [0, 1)$ it holds that*

$$\sqrt{\frac{(1-\delta)l}{n}} \leq \sigma_k(\mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{W}) \quad (5)$$

with failure probability at most

$$\mathcal{P}_f = k \left[\frac{e^{-\delta}}{(1-\delta)^{1-\delta}} \right]^{\alpha \log(k)},$$

i.e., Equation (5) holds with probability at least $1 - \mathcal{P}_f$.

Compared to Lemma 3.2 from [28], we removed the bound on the largest singular value (which will not be needed for proving the error bounds/quasi-optimality) to improve the bound for the failure probability. The next lemma is a variation of [28, Lemma 3.4].

Lemma 2 (Row norms [28]). *Consider $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times k}$ with orthonormal columns, $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ diagonal, with diagonal entries that are independent random variables uniformly distributed on the complex unit circle, and $\mathbf{F} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ a unitary discrete Fourier transform (DFT). Then, $\mathbf{F} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ has orthonormal columns, and for $\beta \geq 1$ it holds that the probability*

$$\mathcal{P} \left\{ \max_{j=1, \dots, n} \|\mathbf{e}_j^T (\mathbf{F} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{V})\|_2 \geq \sqrt{\frac{k}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{8 \log(\beta n)}{n}} \right\} \leq \frac{1}{\beta}.$$

Proof. The proof follows identically to the proof of Lemma 3.3 provided in [28] because \mathbf{F} is unitary and \mathbf{D} is diagonal with diagonal elements which have absolute value 1. \square

By an identical argument as in the proof of [28, Theorem 3.1], one can show the following probabilistic bounds on the singular values of a matrix with orthonormal columns multiplied by an SRFT.

Proposition 1 (The SRFT preserves geometry [28]). *Consider $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times k}$ with orthonormal columns. Select a parameter l that satisfies*

$$4[\sqrt{k} + \sqrt{8 \log(kn)}]^2 \log(k) \leq l \leq n.$$

Draw an SRFT matrix $\mathbf{\Omega} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times l}$. Then, with probability $1 - 2/k$ it holds that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \leq \sigma_k(\mathbf{\Omega}^H \mathbf{V}).$$

Proof. The proof follows similar to the proof of Theorem 3.2 in [28] (by setting $\beta = k$ in Lemma 2 and $\alpha = 4, \delta = 5/6$ in Lemma 1). However the bound on the failure probability there can be sharpened because the bound on the largest singular value will not be needed to prove the error bounds from Theorems 1 and 2. \square

Lastly, we recall a deterministic error bound [6, Theorem 9.2] on the projection error of a randomized rank- l approximation.

Proposition 2 (Deterministic error bound [6]). *Consider $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ with singular value decomposition $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^H$, and fix $k \geq 0$. Choose a matrix $\mathbf{\Omega} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times l}$, and construct the sample matrix $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{\Omega} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times l}$. Partition $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_1, \mathbf{\Sigma}_2)$ with $\mathbf{\Sigma}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}, \mathbf{\Sigma}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{(m-k) \times (n-k)}, m \geq k, n \geq k$ and $\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2]$ with $\mathbf{V}_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times k}, \mathbf{V}_2 \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times (n-k)}$ and define $\mathbf{\Omega}_1 = \mathbf{V}_1^H \mathbf{\Omega}$ and $\mathbf{\Omega}_2 = \mathbf{V}_2^H \mathbf{\Omega}$. Assuming that $\mathbf{\Omega}_1$ has full row rank, the approximation error satisfies*

$$\|(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{P}_Y)\mathbf{A}\|_F^2 \leq \|\mathbf{\Sigma}_2\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{\Sigma}_2\mathbf{\Omega}_2\mathbf{\Omega}_1^\dagger\|_F^2 \leq \|\mathbf{\Sigma}_2\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{\Sigma}_2\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{\Omega}_2\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{\Omega}_1^\dagger\|_2^2,$$

where $(\cdot)^\dagger$ indicates the pseudo-inverse and \mathbf{P}_Y denotes the orthogonal projector on $\text{range}(\mathbf{Y})$ i.e., $\mathbf{P}_Y = \mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^H$ with \mathbf{U}_Y the matrix of left singular vectors of \mathbf{Y} corresponding to nonzero singular values.

Using these lemmas and propositions, we now prove that the rcSVD procedure yields a basis that is at most a constant factor worse than the optimal cSVD procedure with a constant that is monotonically decreasing in l .

Theorem 1. *If $4(\sqrt{k} + \sqrt{8 \log(kn_s)})^2 \log(k) \leq l \leq n_s$, then the rcSVD basis matrix $\mathbf{V}_{\text{rcSVD}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times 2k}$ satisfies with failure probability $2/k$*

$$\|\mathbf{X}_s - \mathbf{V}_{\text{rcSVD}} \mathbf{V}_{\text{rcSVD}}^T \mathbf{X}_s\|_F^2 \leq C \sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2 = C \|\mathbf{X}_s - \mathbf{V}_{\text{cSVD}} \mathbf{V}_{\text{cSVD}}^T \mathbf{X}_s\|_F^2 \quad (6)$$

with $\sigma_j, j = 1, \dots, n_s$ the non-increasing sequence of singular values of the complex snapshot matrix $\mathbf{X}_c = \mathbf{Q} + i\mathbf{P}$, $\mathbf{X}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times n_s}$ and $C = (\sqrt{1 + 6n_s/l} + 1)^2$.

Proof. First, we recall from Section 2.2 or [3] that each ortho-symplectic matrix \mathbf{V}_E has the structure $\mathbf{V}_E = [\mathbf{E}, \mathbb{J}_{2N}^T \mathbf{E}]$ with $\mathbf{E}^T \mathbf{E} = \mathbf{I}_k$ and $\mathbf{E}^T \mathbb{J}_{2N} \mathbf{E} = \mathbf{0}_k$. Thus, it can be represented as $\mathbf{V}_E = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{V}_Q & -\mathbf{V}_P \\ \mathbf{V}_P & \mathbf{V}_Q \end{pmatrix}$ with $\mathbf{V}_Q^T \mathbf{V}_Q + \mathbf{V}_P^T \mathbf{V}_P = \mathbf{I}_k$, $\mathbf{V}_P^T \mathbf{V}_Q = \mathbf{V}_Q^T \mathbf{V}_P$.

The first step of the proof is to show, that for \mathbf{V}_E ortho-symplectic

$$\|\mathbf{X}_s - \mathbf{V}_E \mathbf{V}_E^T \mathbf{X}_s\|_F^2 = \|\mathbf{X}_c - \mathbf{U}_c \mathbf{U}_c^H \mathbf{X}_c\|_F^2 \quad (7)$$

with $\mathbf{U}_c = \mathbf{V}_Q + i\mathbf{V}_P$ and $\mathbf{X}_c = \mathbf{Q} + i\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times n_s}$. This can be seen as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{X}_s - \mathbf{V}_E \mathbf{V}_E^T \mathbf{X}_s\|_F^2 &= \left\| \mathbf{X}_s - \mathbf{V}_E \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{V}_Q^T \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V}_P^T \mathbf{P} \\ -\mathbf{V}_P^T \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V}_Q^T \mathbf{P} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_F^2 \\ &= \left\| \mathbf{X}_s - \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{V}_Q & -\mathbf{V}_P \\ \mathbf{V}_P & \mathbf{V}_Q \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{V}_Q^T \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V}_P^T \mathbf{P} \\ -\mathbf{V}_P^T \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V}_Q^T \mathbf{P} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_F^2 \\ &= \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Q} \\ \mathbf{P} \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{V}_Q \mathbf{V}_Q^T \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V}_Q \mathbf{V}_P^T \mathbf{P} + \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^T \mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_Q^T \mathbf{P} \\ \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_Q^T \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^T \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{V}_Q \mathbf{V}_P^T \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V}_Q \mathbf{V}_Q^T \mathbf{P} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_F^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{Q} - (\mathbf{V}_Q \mathbf{V}_Q^T \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V}_Q \mathbf{V}_P^T \mathbf{P} + \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^T \mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_Q^T \mathbf{P})\|_F^2 \\ &\quad + \|\mathbf{P} - (\mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_Q^T \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^T \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{V}_Q \mathbf{V}_P^T \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V}_Q \mathbf{V}_Q^T \mathbf{P})\|_F^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \|\mathbf{Q} - (\mathbf{V}_Q \mathbf{V}_Q^\top \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V}_Q \mathbf{V}_P^\top \mathbf{P} + \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top \mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_Q^\top \mathbf{P}) \\
&\quad + i(\mathbf{P} - (\mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_Q^\top \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V}_P \mathbf{V}_P^\top \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{V}_Q \mathbf{V}_P^\top \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V}_Q \mathbf{V}_Q^\top \mathbf{P}))\|_F^2 \\
&= \|\mathbf{X}_c - (\mathbf{V}_Q + i\mathbf{V}_P)(\mathbf{V}_Q^\top \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V}_P^\top \mathbf{P} + i(-\mathbf{V}_P^\top \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{V}_Q^\top \mathbf{P}))\|_F^2 \\
&= \|\mathbf{X}_c - (\mathbf{V}_Q + i\mathbf{V}_P)(\mathbf{V}_Q^\top - i\mathbf{V}_P^\top)(\mathbf{Q} + i\mathbf{P})\|_F^2 \\
&= \|\mathbf{X}_c - \mathbf{U}_c \mathbf{U}_c^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{X}_c\|_F^2.
\end{aligned}$$

If we insert the randomized basis matrix $\mathbf{U}_Y \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times l}$ from Algorithm 2 for \mathbf{U}_c , in order to bound $\|\mathbf{X}_c - \mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{X}_c\|_F^2$ we can make use of the second bound from Proposition 2.

The next step is to bound the increase in the projection error if we truncate to a basis of size k (see [6, Section 9.4]). Note that this part of the proof works only with the refined method presented in Algorithm 2 and not with the initial version in [23]. Let \mathbf{U}_c^r be the randomized rank- k basis matrix from Algorithm 2. First, we split the error using the triangle inequality:

$$\|\mathbf{X}_c - \mathbf{U}_c^r (\mathbf{U}_c^r)^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{X}_c\|_F = \|\mathbf{X}_c - \mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{X}_c + \mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{X}_c - \mathbf{U}_c^r (\mathbf{U}_c^r)^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{X}_c\|_F \quad (8)$$

$$\leq \|\mathbf{X}_c - \mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{X}_c\|_F + \|\mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{X}_c - \mathbf{U}_c^r (\mathbf{U}_c^r)^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{X}_c\|_F. \quad (9)$$

For $\|\mathbf{X}_c - \mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{X}_c\|_F$ the bounds from Proposition 2 which depend on the random sketching approach can be applied.

Next, we define $\mathbf{B} := \mathbf{U}_Y^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{X}_c$ according to Algorithm 2 with the singular value decomposition

$$\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{U}_B \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B \mathbf{V}_B^\mathbf{H},$$

and

$$\mathbf{U}_{B(k)} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{B(k)} \mathbf{V}_{B(k)}^\mathbf{H} \approx \mathbf{B}$$

the rank- k truncated SVD of \mathbf{B} , where

$$\mathbf{U}_B \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times l}, \mathbf{V}_B \in \mathbb{C}^{l \times l}$$

and

$$\mathbf{U}_{B(k)} \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times k}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{B(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}, \mathbf{V}_{B(k)} \in \mathbb{C}^{l \times k}.$$

Using these quantities, we set

$$\mathbf{C} := \mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_B \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B \mathbf{V}_B^\mathbf{H}.$$

Then, $\mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_B \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times l}$ has orthonormal columns. Thus, a singular value decomposition $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{U}_C \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_C \mathbf{V}_C^\mathbf{H}$ can be formed by constructing $\mathbf{U}_C \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ from extending $\mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_B$ by orthogonal columns, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_C \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times l}$ from zero padding of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B$ and $\mathbf{V}_C^\mathbf{H}$ equals $\mathbf{V}_B^\mathbf{H}$. As $\mathbf{U}_c^r = \mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_{B(k)}$ consists of the first k columns of \mathbf{U}_C , it follows that $\mathbf{U}_c^r (\mathbf{U}_c^r)^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{U}_c^r \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{B(k)} \mathbf{V}_{B(k)}^\mathbf{H} \approx \mathbf{C}$ is the rank- k truncated SVD of \mathbf{C} . Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{U}_c^r (\mathbf{U}_c^r)^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{C} &= \mathbf{U}_c^r (\mathbf{U}_c^r)^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{U}_c^r (\mathbf{U}_c^r)^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{X}_c \\
&= \underbrace{\mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_{B(k)}}_{=\mathbf{U}_c^r} \underbrace{\mathbf{U}_{B(k)}^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{U}_Y^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{X}_c}_{=\mathbf{U}_{B(k)}^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{U}_Y^\mathbf{H} = (\mathbf{U}_c^r)^\mathbf{H}} = \mathbf{U}_c^r (\mathbf{U}_c^r)^\mathbf{H} \mathbf{X}_c.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{X}_{c(k)} = \mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{X}_{c(k)}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{X}_{c(k)}} \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{X}_{c(k)}}^H$ denote the rank- k truncated SVD of \mathbf{X}_c . Since the matrix $\mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^H \mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{X}_{c(k)}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{X}_{c(k)}} \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{X}_{c(k)}}^H$ has at most rank k

$$\| \underbrace{\mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^H \mathbf{X}_c}_{=\mathbf{C}} - \underbrace{\mathbf{U}_c^r (\mathbf{U}_c^r)^H \mathbf{X}_c}_{\mathbf{U}_c^r (\mathbf{U}_c^r)^H \mathbf{C}} \|_F = \|\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{U}_c^r (\mathbf{U}_c^r)^H \mathbf{C}\|_F \quad (10)$$

$$\leq \|\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^H \mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{X}_{c(k)}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{X}_{c(k)}} \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{X}_{c(k)}}^H\|_F \quad (11)$$

$$= \|\mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^H \mathbf{X}_c - \mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^H \mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{X}_{c(k)}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{X}_{c(k)}} \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{X}_{c(k)}}^H\|_F \quad (12)$$

$$= \|\mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^H (\mathbf{X}_c - \mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{X}_{c(k)}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{X}_{c(k)}} \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{X}_{c(k)}}^H)\|_F \quad (13)$$

$$\leq \|\mathbf{X}_c - \mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{X}_{c(k)}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{X}_{c(k)}} \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{X}_{c(k)}}^H\|_F \quad (14)$$

$$= \sqrt{\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2}, \quad (15)$$

where we used the best-approximation property for obtaining (11), factoring out for (13), non-expansiveness of the orthogonal projection $\mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^H$ for obtaining (14) and the definition of the singular values to reach (15).

Together with Equation (9), Equation (15), Proposition 2 and Proposition 1 the above implies that with failure probability $2/k$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{X}_s - \mathbf{V}_{\text{rcSVD}} \mathbf{V}_{\text{rcSVD}}^T \mathbf{X}_s\|_F &= \|\mathbf{X}_c - \mathbf{U}_c^r (\mathbf{U}_c^r)^H \mathbf{X}_c\|_F \\ &\stackrel{(9)}{\leq} \|\mathbf{X}_c - \mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^H \mathbf{X}_c\|_F + \|\mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^H \mathbf{X}_c - \mathbf{U}_c^r (\mathbf{U}_c^r)^H \mathbf{X}_c\|_F \\ &\stackrel{(15)}{\leq} \|\mathbf{X}_c - \mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_Y^H \mathbf{X}_c\|_F + \sqrt{\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Prop. 2}}{\leq} \sqrt{\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F^2 \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_2\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1^\dagger\|_2^2} + \sqrt{\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2} \\ &\stackrel{\text{Prop. 1}}{\leq} \sqrt{\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F^2 + 6n_s/l \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2\|_F^2} + \sqrt{\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2} \\ &= (\sqrt{1 + 6n_s/l} + 1) \sqrt{\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2} \end{aligned}$$

if $4(\sqrt{k} + \sqrt{8 \log(kn_s)})^2 \log(k) \leq l \leq n_s$. Here, in the second last inequality we bound

$$\|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_2\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{V}_2^H \boldsymbol{\Omega}\|_2^2 \leq \|\mathbf{V}_2^H\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}\|_2^2 = \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}\|_2^2 \leq n_s/l$$

as, up to the scaling factor $\sqrt{n_s/l}$, the SFRT matrix $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \sqrt{n_s/l} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{F} \mathbf{R}$ (Definition 1) has orthonormal columns, i.e., $\|\mathbf{D} \mathbf{F} \mathbf{R}\|_2 = 1$. Moreover, we bound $\|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1^\dagger\|_2$ via

$$\|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1^\dagger\|_2 = \sigma_1(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1^\dagger) = \sigma_k(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1)^{-1} = \sigma_k(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1^H)^{-1} = \sigma_k(\boldsymbol{\Omega}^H \mathbf{V}_1)^{-1} \stackrel{\text{Prop. 1}}{\leq} \sqrt{6}.$$

□

From this bound we obtain a better understanding of the method: We know that we are at most a factor $(\sqrt{1 + 6n_s/l} + 1)$ worse than the optimal solution (in the set of ortho-symplectic matrices) which gives the method a stronger theoretical foundation. Furthermore, it tells us how to choose hyperparameters to obtain theoretical guarantees: Given number of snapshots n_s and a target rank k choose p_{ovs} such that

$$4(\sqrt{k} + \sqrt{8 \log(kn_s)})^2 \log(k) - k \leq p_{\text{ovs}} \leq n_s - k.$$

4 Influence of Power Iterations on the Error (Bound)

In this section, we analyze how the choice of the number of power iterations q_{pow} influences the error (bound) in interplay with the oversampling parameter p_{ovs} . First, we reformulate Theorem 4.4 from [29] for complex matrices:

Proposition 3 ([29]). *Consider $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) = \min(m, n)$ and \mathbf{Q} a matrix with orthonormal columns spanning the range of $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}^H \mathbf{A})^{q_{\text{pow}}} \mathbf{\Omega} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times l}$, $l = k + p_{\text{ovs}} \leq n$ with a sketching matrix $\mathbf{\Omega} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times l}$. Let $\text{rank}(\mathbf{Y}) = l$. Then, for any s with $0 \leq s \leq l - k$ holds ¹*

$$\|(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H)\mathbf{A}\|_F \leq \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}_{(k)}\|_F \quad (16)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\frac{\alpha^2 \|\mathbf{\Omega}_2\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{\Omega}_1^\dagger\|_2^2}{1 + \gamma^2 \|\mathbf{\Omega}_2\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{\Omega}_1^\dagger\|_2^2} + \sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2} \quad (17)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\alpha^2 \|\mathbf{\Omega}_2\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{\Omega}_1^\dagger\|_2^2 + \sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2} \quad (18)$$

with $\mathbf{B}_{(k)}$ the rank- k truncated SVD of $\mathbf{Q}^H \mathbf{A}$ and $\alpha = \sqrt{k} \sigma_{l-s+1} (\frac{\sigma_{l-s+1}}{\sigma_k})^{2q_{\text{pow}}}$, $\gamma = \frac{\sigma_{l-s+1}}{\sigma_1} (\frac{\sigma_{l-s+1}}{\sigma_k})^{2q_{\text{pow}}}$ where $\sigma_j, j = 1, \dots, n_s$ denote the non-increasing sequence of singular values of \mathbf{A} . The matrices $\mathbf{\Omega}_1, \mathbf{\Omega}_2$ are defined as follows: Let $\hat{\mathbf{\Omega}} := \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{\Omega}$ and split $\hat{\mathbf{\Omega}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{\Omega}_1 \\ \mathbf{\Omega}_2 \end{pmatrix}$ with $\mathbf{\Omega}_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{(l-s) \times l}$, $\mathbf{\Omega}_2 \in \mathbb{C}^{(n-l+s) \times l}$ where we assume that $\mathbf{\Omega}_1$ has full row rank.

In [29] only real matrices with $m \geq n$ have been assumed. However, the proof works in a similar way also in a more general setting for complex matrices of arbitrary size as we will explain in the following. The additional assumption $\text{rank}(\mathbf{Y}) = l$ is very likely to be fulfilled in practice because the orthogonal complement $(\mathbf{A}^H)^\perp$ of \mathbf{A}^H is a null set in \mathbb{R}^n and it is very unlikely (zero probability in exact arithmetics) that for a random vector $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ it holds that $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in (\mathbf{A}^H)^\perp$. Furthermore, a family of random vectors $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, i = 1, \dots, l \leq n$ is linearly dependent with zero probability in exact arithmetics.

In order to prove Proposition 3, the following inequality is proven first:

Lemma 3. *Consider $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times k}$ with orthonormal columns. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H)\mathbf{A}\|_F &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}_{(k)}\|_F \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H \mathbf{A}_{(k)}\|_F \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sqrt{\|(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H)\mathbf{A}_{(k)}\|_F^2 + \sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2}. \end{aligned}$$

with $\mathbf{A}_{(k)}$ the rank- k truncated SVD of \mathbf{A} .

Proof. We start with the inequality (a):

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}_{(k)}\|_F^2 &= \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}_{(k)}\|_F^2 \\ &= \|(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H)\mathbf{A}\|_F^2 + 2\text{Re}(\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}^H \underbrace{(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H)\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{Q}^H \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}_{(k)})}_{=0})) \quad (19) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \|\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{Q}^H \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}_{(k)})\|_F^2 \\ &= \|(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H)\mathbf{A}\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{Q}^H \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}_{(k)}\|_F^2 \quad (20) \end{aligned}$$

¹Note that due to preventing a notation clash we renamed the parameter p from [29] to s .

which implies

$$\|(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H)\mathbf{A}\|_F^2 = \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}_{(k)}\|_F^2 - \|\mathbf{Q}^H\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}_{(k)}\|_F^2 \leq \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}_{(k)}\|_F^2.$$

Next, inequality (b) is shown: By the identical argument as in Equation (20) for every $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{C}^{k \times n}$ it holds that

$$\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}\|_F^2 = \|(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H)\mathbf{A}\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{Q}^H\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\|_F^2.$$

A rank- k -minimizer of $\|\mathbf{Q}^H\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\|_F$ is known to be the rank- k truncated SVD of $\mathbf{Q}^H\mathbf{A} \approx \mathbf{B}_{(k)}$. Since $\|(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H)\mathbf{A}\|_F^2$ does not depend on \mathbf{B} , a rank- k minimizer \mathbf{B} of $\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}\|_F$ is a rank- k -minimizer of $\|\mathbf{Q}^H\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\|_F$. Since $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H\mathbf{A}_{(k)}$ is at most of rank k , we obtain (b)

$$\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}_{(k)}\|_F \leq \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H\mathbf{A}_{(k)}\|_F.$$

Lastly, inequality (c) is shown:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H\mathbf{A}_{(k)}\|_F^2 &= \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_{(k)} + \mathbf{A}_{(k)} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H\mathbf{A}_{(k)}\|_F^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_{(k)}\|_F^2 + 2\text{Re}(\text{tr}((\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_{(k)})^H(\mathbf{A}_{(k)} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H\mathbf{A}_{(k)}))) \\ &\quad + \|\mathbf{A}_{(k)} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H\mathbf{A}_{(k)}\|_F^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_{(k)}\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{A}_{(k)} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H\mathbf{A}_{(k)}\|_F^2 \\ &= \sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2 + \|\mathbf{A}_{(k)} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H\mathbf{A}_{(k)}\|_F^2. \end{aligned}$$

where the middle term vanishes as

$$\begin{aligned} &2\text{Re}(\text{tr}((\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_{(k)})^H(\mathbf{A}_{(k)} - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H\mathbf{A}_{(k)}))) \\ &= 2\text{Re}(\text{tr}((\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_{(k)})^H(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H)\mathbf{A}_{(k)})) \\ &= 2\text{Re}(\text{tr}((\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H)\underbrace{\mathbf{A}_{(k)}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}_{(k)})^H}_{=0})) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

Next, another auxiliary statement is proven:

Lemma 4. Consider the matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, with $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) = \min(n, m)$, $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{l \times l}$, $l < \min(n, m)$ to be non-singular, $\mathbf{\Omega} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times l}$ such that $\text{rank}(\mathbf{Y}) = l$ with $\mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^H)^{q_{\text{pow}}}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{\Omega}$. Let $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{Y}$ be the QR-factorization of \mathbf{Y} with $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times l}$, $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{C}^{l \times l}$, with $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}\hat{\mathbf{R}} = \mathbf{Y}_X := \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}$ be the QR-factorization of \mathbf{Y}_X with $\hat{\mathbf{Q}} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times l}$, $\hat{\mathbf{R}} \in \mathbb{C}^{l \times l}$. Then,

$$\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H = \hat{\mathbf{Q}}\hat{\mathbf{Q}}^H. \quad (21)$$

Proof. The proof follows from elementary calculations:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H &= \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{R}^H)^{-1}\mathbf{R}^H\mathbf{Q}^H = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{R}^H\mathbf{R})^{-1}\mathbf{R}^H\mathbf{Q}^H \\ &= \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{R}^H\mathbf{Q}^H\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R})^{-1}\mathbf{R}^H\mathbf{Q}^H = \mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{Y}^H\mathbf{Y})^{-1}\mathbf{Y}^H \\ &= \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^{-1}(\mathbf{Y}^H\mathbf{Y})^{-1}(\mathbf{X}^H)^{-1}\mathbf{X}^H\mathbf{Y}^H \\ &= \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{X}^H\mathbf{Y}^H\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}^H\mathbf{Y}^H = \mathbf{Y}_X(\mathbf{Y}_X^H\mathbf{Y}_X)^{-1}\mathbf{Y}_X^H \\ &= \hat{\mathbf{Q}}\hat{\mathbf{Q}}^H \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the equivalent reverse arguments of the first two lines. □

The next step is proving a further upper bound:

Lemma 5. Consider $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) = \min(n, m)$ with $\mathbf{A}_{(k)}$ the rank- k -best approximation of \mathbf{A} . Let $\mathbf{QR} = \mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^H)^{q_{\text{pow}}} \mathbf{A}\mathbf{\Omega}$ be the QR-factorization of \mathbf{Y} and $\text{rank}(\mathbf{Y}) = l$. Then,

$$\|(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H)\mathbf{A}_{(k)}\|_F^2 \leq \frac{\alpha^2 \|\mathbf{\Omega}_2\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{\Omega}_1^\dagger\|_2^2}{1 + \gamma^2 \|\mathbf{\Omega}_2\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{\Omega}_1^\dagger\|_2^2}, \quad (22)$$

with $\alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{\Omega}_1, \mathbf{\Omega}_2$ defined as in Proposition 3.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}^H$, $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times \min(m, n)}$, $\mathbf{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{\min(m, n) \times n}$, $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be the singular value decomposition of \mathbf{A} . Define $\hat{\mathbf{\Omega}} = \mathbf{V}^H \mathbf{\Omega}$ and split $\hat{\mathbf{\Omega}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{\Omega}_1 \\ \mathbf{\Omega}_2 \end{pmatrix}$, with $\mathbf{\Omega}_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{(l-s) \times l}$, $\mathbf{\Omega}_2 \in \mathbb{C}^{(n-l+s) \times l}$. Split $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \text{blkdiag}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_1, \mathbf{\Sigma}_2, \mathbf{\Sigma}_3)$, with $\mathbf{\Sigma}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{(l-s-k) \times (l-s-k)}$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{(\min(m, n) - l + s) \times (n - l + s)}$. Let $\mathbf{\Omega}_1^\dagger$ denote the pseudo-inverse of $\mathbf{\Omega}_1$. Since $\mathbf{\Omega}_1$ has full row rank it holds that

$$\mathbf{\Omega}_1 \mathbf{\Omega}_1^\dagger = \mathbf{I}_{l-s}.$$

Choose

$$\mathbf{X} = \left[\mathbf{\Omega}_1^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{\Sigma}_1 & \mathbf{0}_{k, l-s-k} \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k, k} & \mathbf{\Sigma}_2 \end{pmatrix}^{-(2q_{\text{pow}}+1)}, \hat{\mathbf{X}} \right],$$

where the matrix $\hat{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbb{C}^{l \times s}$ is chosen such that \mathbf{X} is non-singular and $\hat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{0}$.

Since the matrix $\mathbf{\Omega}_1^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{\Sigma}_1 & \mathbf{0}_{k, l-s-k} \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k, k} & \mathbf{\Sigma}_2 \end{pmatrix}^{-(2q_{\text{pow}}+1)}$ has full column rank (as $\mathbf{\Omega}_1$ has full row rank and $\sigma_i > 0, i = 1 \dots \min(m, n)$) and for $s \geq 1$ such a matrix \mathbf{X} must always exist because of the rank-nullity theorem as $\hat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{l-s \times l}$ is assumed to have full row rank, i.e., $\text{rank}(\hat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1) = l - s$. Therefore

$$\dim(\ker(\hat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1)) = l - (l - s) = s$$

must hold. Hence, s linearly independent vectors from $\ker(\hat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1)$ can be chosen and stacked to form $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$. The column vectors of $\mathbf{\Omega}_1^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{\Sigma}_1 & \mathbf{0}_{k, l-s-k} \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k, k} & \mathbf{\Sigma}_2 \end{pmatrix}^{-(2q_{\text{pow}}+1)}$ do not lie in the null-space of $\hat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_1$ by construction and therefore must be linearly independent from $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$. With the choice

$$\mathbf{X} = \left[\mathbf{\Omega}_1^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{\Sigma}_1 & \mathbf{0}_{k, l-s-k} \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k, k} & \mathbf{\Sigma}_2 \end{pmatrix}^{-(2q_{\text{pow}}+1)}, \hat{\mathbf{X}} \right]$$

we have the following structure for $\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}$:

$$\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{U} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_k & \mathbf{0}_{k, l-s-k} & \mathbf{0}_{k, n-l+s} \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k, k} & \mathbf{I}_{l-s-k} & \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k, n-l+s} \\ \mathbf{H}_1 & \mathbf{H}_2 & \mathbf{H}_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

with

$$\mathbf{H}_1 = \mathbf{\Sigma}_3 (\mathbf{\Sigma}_3^T \mathbf{\Sigma}_3)^{2q_{\text{pow}}} \mathbf{\Omega}_2 \mathbf{\Omega}_1^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{\Sigma}_1^{-2q_{\text{pow}}+1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k, k} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(\min(m, n) - l + s) \times k}$$

$$\mathbf{H}_2 = \mathbf{\Sigma}_3 (\mathbf{\Sigma}_3^T \mathbf{\Sigma}_3)^{2q_{\text{pow}}} \mathbf{\Omega}_2 \mathbf{\Omega}_1^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{k, l-s-k} \\ \mathbf{\Sigma}_2^{-2q_{\text{pow}}+1} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(\min(m, n) - l + s) \times (l - s - k)}$$

$$\mathbf{H}_3 = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_3 (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_3^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_3)^{2q_{\text{pow}}} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_2 \hat{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbb{R}^{(\min(m,n)-l+s) \times (n-l+s)}.$$

Next, we similarly split the QR-factorization of \mathbf{YX} into blocks:

$$\mathbf{YX} = \hat{\mathbf{Q}}\hat{\mathbf{R}} = (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_2 \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_3) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{11} & \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{12} & \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{13} \\ \mathbf{0} & \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{22} & \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{23} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{33} \end{pmatrix}.$$

This also results in the QR factorization

$$\mathbf{U} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_k \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k,k} \\ \mathbf{H}_1 \end{pmatrix} = \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{11}. \quad (23)$$

With (21) and by restricting the number of columns of $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}$ we have

$$\|(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^H)\mathbf{A}_{(k)}\| = \|(\mathbf{I}_m - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}\hat{\mathbf{Q}}^H)\mathbf{A}_{(k)}\| \leq \|(\mathbf{I}_m - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1^H)\mathbf{A}_{(k)}\| \quad (24)$$

with $\mathbf{A}_{(k)} = \mathbf{U}\text{blkdiag}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1, \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k}, \mathbf{0}_{n-l+s})\mathbf{V}^H$. The last step of the proof is to derive a bound for $\|(\mathbf{I}_m - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1^H)\mathbf{A}_{(k)}\|$. First, we use the QR factorization from (23) to reformulate $\|(\mathbf{I}_m - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1^H)\mathbf{A}_{(k)}\|$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\mathbf{I}_m - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1^H)\mathbf{A}_{(k)}\|_F = \\ & \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{\min(m,n)} - \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_k \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k,k} \\ \mathbf{H}_1 \end{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{11}^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{11}^H)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_k \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k,k} \\ \mathbf{H}_1 \end{pmatrix}^H \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-s-l,k} \\ \mathbf{0}_{\min(m,n)-l+s,k} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_F. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Next, we reformulate $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{11}^{-1}(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{11}^H)^{-1}$:

$$\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{11}^{-1}(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{11}^H)^{-1} = (\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{11}^H \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{11})^{-1} = \left(\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_k \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k,k} \\ \mathbf{H}_1 \end{pmatrix}^H \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1^H \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1 \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_k \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k,k} \\ \mathbf{H}_1 \end{pmatrix} \right)^{-1} \quad (26)$$

$$= (\mathbf{I}_k + \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1)^{-1}. \quad (27)$$

Inserting that into Equation (25) results in

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\mathbf{I}_m - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1^H)\mathbf{A}_{(k)}\|_F \quad (28) \\ & = \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{\min(m,n)} - \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_k \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k,k} \\ \mathbf{H}_1 \end{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{11}^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{11}^H)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_k \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k,k} \\ \mathbf{H}_1 \end{pmatrix}^H \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k,k} \\ \mathbf{0}_{\min(m,n)-l+s,k} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_F \\ & \stackrel{27}{=} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k,k} \\ \mathbf{0}_{\min(m,n)-l+s,k} \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_k \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k,k} \\ \mathbf{H}_1 \end{pmatrix} (\mathbf{I}_k + \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \right\|_F \\ & = \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_k - (\mathbf{I}_k + \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1)^{-1} \\ \mathbf{H}_1 (\mathbf{I}_k + \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \right\|_F. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Next, we reformulate the second component $\mathbf{H}_1(\mathbf{I}_k + \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1)^{-1}$ of the right side of (29):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_1(\mathbf{I}_k + \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1)^{-1} &= (\mathbf{H}_1^{-1})^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_k + \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1)^{-1} = ((\mathbf{I}_k + \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1)\mathbf{H}_1^{-1})^{-1} \\ &= (\mathbf{H}_1^{-1} + \mathbf{H}_1^H)^{-1} = (\mathbf{H}_1^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_{n-l+s} + \mathbf{H}_1\mathbf{H}_1^H))^{-1} \\ &= (\mathbf{I}_{\min(m,n)-l+s} + \mathbf{H}_1\mathbf{H}_1^H)^{-1}\mathbf{H}_1 \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

and then the first component of the right hand side of (29)

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{I}_k - (\mathbf{I}_k + \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1)^{-1}) &= (\mathbf{I}_k + \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1)(\mathbf{I}_k + \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1)^{-1} - (\mathbf{I}_k + \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1)^{-1} \\
&= (\mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1)(\mathbf{I}_k + \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1)^{-1} \\
&\stackrel{(30)}{=} \mathbf{H}_1^H (\mathbf{I}_{\min(m,n)-l+s} + \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{H}_1^H)^{-1} \mathbf{H}_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting this into (29) and factorizing yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(\mathbf{I}_m - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_1^H) \mathbf{A}_{(k)}\|_F \\
&= \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{H}_1^H \\ \mathbf{I}_{\min(m,n)-(l-s)} \end{pmatrix} (\mathbf{I}_{\min(m,n)-(l-s)} + \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{H}_1^H)^{-1} \mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \right\|_F \\
&= \text{tr}((\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)^H (\mathbf{I}_{\min(m,n)-(l-s)} + \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{H}_1^H)^{-H} \mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1) \\
&= \text{tr}((\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)^H (\mathbf{I}_{\min(m,n)-(l-s)} + \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{H}_1^H)^{-1} \mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1) \\
&= \text{tr}(((\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)^{-H})^{-1} (\mathbf{I}_{\min(m,n)-(l-s)} + \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{H}_1^H)^{-1} ((\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)^{-1})^{-1}) \\
&= \text{tr}(((\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)^{-1} (\mathbf{I}_{\min(m,n)-(l-s)} + \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{H}_1^H) (\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)^{-H})^{-1}) \\
&= \text{tr}((\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1} \mathbf{H}_1^{-1} (\mathbf{I}_{\min(m,n)-(l-s)} + \mathbf{H}_1 \mathbf{H}_1^H) \mathbf{H}_1^{-H} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1})^{-1}) \\
&= \text{tr}((\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1} \mathbf{H}_1^{-1} \mathbf{H}_1^{-H} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1})^{-1}) \\
&= \text{tr}((\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-2})^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we further analyze $\text{tr}((\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-2})^{-1}$. First, we recall that for Hermitian matrices $\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{F} \in \mathbb{C}^{k \times k}$ it follows from Courant-Fischer that

$$\lambda_j(\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{F}) \geq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{E}) + \lambda_j(\mathbf{F}), \text{ with } 1 \leq j \leq k.$$

This implies, that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_j((\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-2}) &\geq \lambda_{\min}((\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)^{-1}) + \lambda_j(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-2}) \\
&= \|(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)\|_2^{-1} + \lambda_j(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-2}) \\
&= \|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2^{-2} + \lambda_j(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-2}) \\
&= \lambda_j(\|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2^{-2} \mathbf{I}_k + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-2})
\end{aligned}$$

where we use at the first equality that

$$\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{M}^{-1}) = \frac{1}{\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{M})} = \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{M}\|_2} = \|\mathbf{M}\|_2^{-1}$$

for every invertible matrix $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and at the last equality that the j -th eigenvalue of the diagonal matrix $\|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2^{-2} \mathbf{I}_k + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-2}$ is its j -th diagonal value which is $\|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2^{-2} + \lambda_j(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-2})$. Therefore, the eigenvalues of the matrix $(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-2}$ are larger than the eigenvalues of the matrix $(\|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2^{-2} \mathbf{I}_k + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-2})$. Therefore, the eigenvalues of $((\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-2})^{-1}$ are smaller than the eigenvalues of

$(\|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|^{-2} \mathbf{I}_k + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-2})^{-1}$ and consequently also the trace. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{tr}((\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \mathbf{H}_1^H \mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1)^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-2})^{-1} &\leq \text{tr}((\|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2^{-2} \mathbf{I}_k + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-2})^{-1}) \\
&= \text{tr}((\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1} (\|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2^{-2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^2 + \mathbf{I}_k) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1})^{-1}) \\
&= \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 (\|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2^{-2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^2 + \mathbf{I}_k)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1) \\
&= \|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2^2 \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^2 + \|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2^2 \mathbf{I}_k)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1) \\
&= \|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2^2 \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\sigma_j^2}{\|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2^2 + \sigma_j^2} \\
&\leq \|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2^2 k \frac{\sigma_1^2}{\|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2^2 + \sigma_1^2} \\
&= \frac{k \|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2^2 \sigma_1^{-2} + 1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Lastly, one has to estimate the norm $\|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2$. It holds, that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{H}_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\|_2 &= \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_3 (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_3^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_3)^{q_{\text{pow}}} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_2 \boldsymbol{\Omega}_1^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-2q_{\text{pow}}+1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-s-k,k} \end{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_3 (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_3^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_3)^{q_{\text{pow}}}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_2\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1^\dagger\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-2q}\|_2 \\
&\leq \sigma_{l-s+1} \left(\frac{\sigma_{l-s+1}}{\sigma_k} \right)^{2q_{\text{pow}}} \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_2\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1^\dagger\|_2,
\end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Remark. By a density argument this result also holds for general matrices $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ with $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) < \min(m, n)$.

Now, combining Lemmas 3 to 5 with Proposition 1 we prove the following:

Theorem 2. If $4(\sqrt{k} + \sqrt{8 \log(k n_s)})^2 \log(k) \leq l \leq n_s$, then the rcSVD basis matrix $\mathbf{V}_{\text{rcSVD}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times 2k}$ satisfies with failure probability $2/k$

$$\|\mathbf{X}_s - \mathbf{V}_{\text{rcSVD}} \mathbf{V}_{\text{rcSVD}}^T \mathbf{X}_s\|_F \leq \sqrt{\left(\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2 \right) + \frac{\alpha^2 \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_2\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1^\dagger\|_2^2}{1 + \gamma^2 \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_2\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1^\dagger\|_2^2}} \quad (31)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\left(\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2 \right) + \frac{6\sigma_{l+1}^2 \left(\frac{\sigma_{l+1}}{\sigma_k} \right)^{4q_{\text{pow}}} k n_s / l}{1 + 6 \frac{\sigma_{l+1}^2}{\sigma_1^2} \left(\frac{\sigma_{l+1}}{\sigma_k} \right)^{4q_{\text{pow}}} n_s / l}} \quad (32)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\left(\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2 \right) + 6\sigma_{l+1}^2 \left(\frac{\sigma_{l+1}}{\sigma_k} \right)^{4q_{\text{pow}}} k n_s / l.} \quad (33)$$

with $\sigma_j, j = 1, \dots, n_s$ the non-increasing sequence of singular values of the complex snapshot matrix $\mathbf{X}_c = \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{iP}$, $\mathbf{X}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times n_s}$.

Proof. The first inequality follows directly from the Lemmas 3 to 5, the second one by bounding $\|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_2\|_2^2 \leq n_s/l$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1^\dagger\|_2 \leq 6$. The third one follows because $1 + 6 \frac{\sigma_{l+1}}{\sigma_1} \left(\frac{\sigma_{l+1}}{\sigma_k} \right)^{4q_{\text{pow}}} n_s / l \geq 1$. \square

Remark. These results also hold (by setting $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{U}_Y$) for the truncated projection

$$\|(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{U}_c^T (\mathbf{U}_c^T)^H) \mathbf{A}\|_F^2 = \|(\mathbf{I}_m - \mathbf{U}_Y \mathbf{U}_{B(k)} \mathbf{U}_{B(k)}^H \mathbf{U}_Y^H) \mathbf{A}\|_F = \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{B}_{(k)}\|_F.$$

Remark. The parameter s is not a methodical parameter but can be used to optimize the bound as the norms of the random matrices depend on s . For Gaussian matrices $s \geq 2$ leads to lower norms of $\|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_2\|_2, \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1^\dagger\|_2$. For the SRFT we only have a bound for $s = 0$ (Proposition 1 or [6, Theorem 11.2]).

To understand the influence of power iterations, we compare this bound to the bound from Equation (16) which states

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{X}_s - \mathbf{V}_{\text{rcSVD}} \mathbf{V}_{\text{rcSVD}}^T \mathbf{X}_s\|_F &\leq (\sqrt{1 + 6n_s/l} + 1) \sqrt{\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2} \\ &= \sqrt{\left(\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2\right) + 6n_s/l \sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2} + \sqrt{\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2} \end{aligned}$$

whereas with the Theorem from [29] we get

$$\|\mathbf{X}_s - \mathbf{V}_{\text{rcSVD}} \mathbf{V}_{\text{rcSVD}}^T \mathbf{X}_s\|_F \leq \sqrt{\left(\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2\right) + (6n_s/l) k \sigma_{l+1}^2 \left(\frac{\sigma_{l+1}}{\sigma_k}\right)^{4q_{\text{pow}}}}. \quad (34)$$

Here, we do not have the additional term $\sqrt{\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2}$ that resulted from the truncation step (15). Furthermore, the second term under the square root in Equation (34) has the squared $(l+1)$ -th singular value instead of the sum of all $\sigma_j^2, j \geq k+1$. Moreover, we have the additional factor $k \left(\frac{\sigma_{l+1}}{\sigma_k}\right)^{4q_{\text{pow}}}$. Thus, if this factor is smaller than one, the bound is sharper than the bound from Equation (16). We can further simplify the bound from Equation (34) to

$$\|\mathbf{X}_s - \mathbf{V}_{\text{rcSVD}} \mathbf{V}_{\text{rcSVD}}^T \mathbf{X}_s\|_F \leq \sqrt{\left(\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2\right) + (6n_s/l) k \sigma_{l+1}^2 \left(\frac{\sigma_{l+1}}{\sigma_k}\right)^{4q_{\text{pow}}}} \quad (35)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{1 + 6n_s \left(\frac{\sigma_{l+1}}{\sigma_k}\right)^{4q_{\text{pow}}}} \sqrt{\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2}. \quad (36)$$

where the last estimate makes use of

$$\sigma_{l+1}^2 \leq \sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2,$$

as σ_{l+1}^2 is appearing in that sum, and we use $k/l \leq 1$.

Here, we see that the factor $\sqrt{1 + 6n_s \left(\frac{\sigma_{l+1}}{\sigma_k}\right)^{4q_{\text{pow}}}}$ in Equation (36) converges to 1 for $q \rightarrow \infty$ if we assume there is a gap between the k -th and $(l+1)$ -th singular value.

5 Formulation of rcSVD based on real numbers

For the cSVD algorithm we know that there is an equivalent algorithm that works only with real matrices [3] (the *cSVD via POD of \mathbf{Y}_s*). In this section, we show that also the rcSVD algorithm can be reformulated into a version that works only with real matrices:

Proposition 4. *Given the snapshot matrix $\mathbf{X}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times n_s}$, basis size $2k$, oversampling parameter p_{ovs} and power iteration number q_{pow} define the sketched extended snapshot matrix $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{Y}_s (\mathbf{Y}_s^T \mathbf{Y}_s)^{q_{\text{pow}}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}$ with \mathbf{Y}_s the extended snapshot matrix $\mathbf{Y}_s = [\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbb{J}_{2N} \mathbf{X}_s]$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}$ the block-structured random matrix*

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} := \left[\begin{array}{c} \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Re}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \\ \text{Im}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \end{array} \right), \mathbb{J}_{2N}^T \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Re}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \\ \text{Im}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \end{array} \right) \end{array} \right]$$

with $\boldsymbol{\Omega} \in \mathbb{C}^{n_s \times (k+p_{\text{ovs}})}$. We assume that $2k$ is such that there is a gap in the singular values of \mathbf{Z} , i.e., $\sigma_{2k}(\mathbf{Z}) > \sigma_{2k+1}(\mathbf{Z})$. Then, $\text{rcSVD}(\mathbf{X}_s, 2k, p_{\text{ovs}}, q_{\text{pow}})$ can be computed as $\text{POD}(\mathbf{Z}, 2k)$

Proof. The main step of the rcSVD procedure is to compute an SVD of the complex matrix $\mathbf{Y} := \mathbf{X}_c (\mathbf{X}_c^H \mathbf{X}_c)^{q_{\text{pow}}} \boldsymbol{\Omega}$. According to [3] this is equivalent to computing an SVD of

$$\mathbf{Z} := [[\text{Re}(\mathbf{Y}); \text{Im}(\mathbf{Y})], \mathbb{J}_{2N}^T [\text{Re}(\mathbf{Y}); \text{Im}(\mathbf{Y})]]$$

if there is a gap in the singular values of \mathbf{Z} .

With the definition $\mathbf{M} := \mathbf{X}_c (\mathbf{X}_c^H \mathbf{X}_c)^{q_{\text{pow}}}$ we get

$$\text{Re}(\mathbf{Y}) = \text{Re}(\mathbf{M})\text{Re}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) - \text{Im}(\mathbf{M})\text{Im}(\boldsymbol{\Omega})$$

and

$$\text{Im}(\mathbf{Y}) = \text{Re}(\mathbf{M})\text{Im}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) + \text{Im}(\mathbf{M})\text{Re}(\boldsymbol{\Omega})$$

we can reformulate

$$\begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{Y}) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{Y}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{M}) & -\text{Im}(\mathbf{M}) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{M}) & \text{Re}(\mathbf{M}) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \\ \text{Im}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\mathbb{J}_{2N}^T \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{Y}) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{Y}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\text{Im}(\mathbf{Y}) \\ \text{Re}(\mathbf{Y}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{M}) & -\text{Im}(\mathbf{M}) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{M}) & \text{Re}(\mathbf{M}) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -\text{Im}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \\ \text{Re}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

From this, it follows that

$$\mathbf{Z} = [[\text{Re}(\mathbf{Y}); \text{Im}(\mathbf{Y})], \mathbb{J}_{2N}^T [\text{Re}(\mathbf{Y}); \text{Im}(\mathbf{Y})]] \quad (37)$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{M}) & -\text{Im}(\mathbf{M}) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{M}) & \text{Re}(\mathbf{M}) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) & -\text{Im}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \\ \text{Im}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) & \text{Re}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \end{pmatrix} \quad (38)$$

$$= \left[\begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{M}) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{M}) \end{pmatrix}, \mathbb{J}_{2N}^T \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{M}) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{M}) \end{pmatrix} \right] \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}, \quad (39)$$

where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}$ is defined as

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} := \left[\begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \\ \text{Im}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \end{pmatrix}, \mathbb{J}_{2N}^T \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \\ \text{Im}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \end{pmatrix} \right].$$

Further it holds that

$$\left[\begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{M}) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{M}) \end{pmatrix}, \mathbb{J}_{2N}^T \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{M}) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{M}) \end{pmatrix} \right] = \mathbf{Y}_s (\mathbf{Y}_s^T \mathbf{Y}_s)^{q_{\text{pow}}}$$

with

$$\mathbf{Y}_s := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Q} & -\mathbf{P} \\ \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{Q} \end{pmatrix}.$$

This can be seen by induction: Clearly this equation holds for $q_{\text{pow}} = 0$ by definition of \mathbf{X}_c and \mathbf{Y}_s . We now assume that the equation holds for some $q_{\text{pow}} \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Y}_s(\mathbf{Y}_s^\top \mathbf{Y}_s)^{q_{\text{pow}}+1} &= \mathbf{Y}_s(\mathbf{Y}_s^\top \mathbf{Y}_s)^{q_{\text{pow}}} \mathbf{Y}_s^\top \mathbf{Y}_s \\ &= \left[\begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{M}) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{M}) \end{pmatrix}, \mathbb{J}_{2N}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{M}) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{M}) \end{pmatrix} \right] \mathbf{Y}_s^\top \mathbf{Y}_s \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{M}) & -\text{Im}(\mathbf{M}) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{M}) & \text{Re}(\mathbf{M}) \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{Y}_s^\top \mathbf{Y}_s. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Y}_s^\top \mathbf{Y}_s &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Q}^\top & \mathbf{P}^\top \\ -\mathbf{P}^\top & \mathbf{Q}^\top \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Q} & -\mathbf{P} \\ \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{Q} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{P} & -\mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{P} + \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{Q} \\ \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{Q} & \mathbf{Q}^\top \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{P} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) & -\text{Im}(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) & \text{Re}(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Y}_s(\mathbf{Y}_s^\top \mathbf{Y}_s)^{q_{\text{pow}}+1} &= \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{M}) & -\text{Im}(\mathbf{M}) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{M}) & \text{Re}(\mathbf{M}) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) & -\text{Im}(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) & \text{Re}(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{M}_1 & \mathbf{M}_2 \\ \mathbf{M}_3 & \mathbf{M}_4 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{M} \mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) & -\text{Im}(\mathbf{M} \mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{M} \mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) & \text{Re}(\mathbf{M} \mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \left[\begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{X}_c(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c)^{q_{\text{pow}}+1}) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{X}_c(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c)^{q_{\text{pow}}+1}) \end{pmatrix}, \mathbb{J}_{2N}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{X}_c(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c)^{q_{\text{pow}}+1}) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{X}_c(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c)^{q_{\text{pow}}+1}) \end{pmatrix} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_1 &= \text{Re}(\mathbf{M})\text{Re}(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) - \text{Im}(\mathbf{M})\text{Im}(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) \\ \mathbf{M}_2 &= -\text{Im}(\mathbf{M})\text{Re}(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) - \text{Re}(\mathbf{M})\text{Im}(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) \\ \mathbf{M}_3 &= \text{Im}(\mathbf{M})\text{Re}(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) + \text{Re}(\mathbf{M})\text{Im}(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) \\ \mathbf{M}_4 &= \text{Re}(\mathbf{M})\text{Re}(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c) - \text{Im}(\mathbf{M})\text{Im}(\mathbf{X}_c^\text{H} \mathbf{X}_c). \end{aligned}$$

Thus by the induction principle it follows that

$$\left[\begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{M}) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{M}) \end{pmatrix}, \mathbb{J}_{2N}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(\mathbf{M}) \\ \text{Im}(\mathbf{M}) \end{pmatrix} \right] = \mathbf{Y}_s(\mathbf{Y}_s^\top \mathbf{Y}_s)^{q_{\text{pow}}}$$

for all $q_{\text{pow}} \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Plugging this result into (39) yields

$$\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{Y}_s(\mathbf{Y}_s^\top \mathbf{Y}_s)^{q_{\text{pow}}} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}.$$

□

Therefore, the rcSVD can also be understood as *rcSVD via POD of $\mathbf{Y}_s(\mathbf{Y}_s^\top \mathbf{Y}_s)^{q_{\text{pow}}}$* $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$ or *rcSVD via rPOD of \mathbf{Y}_s* using a special block-structured random matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$ for the random sketching. This can be a useful equivalent characterization that allows results for real matrices to be applied when they are not available for complex matrices. Additionally, a numerical advantage may be a more easy implementation as only real instead of complex arithmetics is required.

6 Numerical Experiments

To analyze what are practical choices for the oversampling parameter p_{ovs} and the number of power iterations q_{pow} , we perform numerical experiments on a 2D wave equation problem. This example has originally been used in [5] as a non-parametric one-dimensional problem and has been extended to the parametric two-dimensional case in [30]. The problem reads: Find the solution $u(t, \boldsymbol{\xi})$ with spatial variable

$$\boldsymbol{\xi} := (\xi_1, \xi_2) \in \Omega := (0, 0.5) \times (0, 3)$$

and temporal variable $t \in I_t(\boldsymbol{\mu}) := [t_0, t_{\text{end}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})]$, with $t_0 = 0$, $t_{\text{end}}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = 2/\boldsymbol{\mu}$ of

$$\begin{aligned} u_{tt}(t, \boldsymbol{\xi}) &= c^2 \Delta u(t, \boldsymbol{\xi}) && \text{in } I_t(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \times \Omega \\ u(t_0, \boldsymbol{\xi}) &= u^0(\boldsymbol{\xi}) := h(s(\boldsymbol{\xi})), && \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_t(t_0, \boldsymbol{\xi}) &= v^0(\boldsymbol{\xi}) && \text{in } \Omega, \\ u(t, \boldsymbol{\xi}) &= 0 && \text{in } I_t(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \times \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$s(\boldsymbol{\xi}) := 4 \left| \left(\xi_2 + \frac{l}{2} - \frac{u_{\text{sup}}^0}{2} \right) / u_{\text{sup}}^0 \right|, \quad h(s) := \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{3}{2}s^2 + \frac{3}{4}s^3, & 0 \leq s \leq 1, \\ \frac{1}{4}(2-s)^3, & 1 < s \leq 2, \\ 0, & s > 2, \end{cases}$$

and

$$v^0(\boldsymbol{\xi}) := \begin{cases} -\frac{4c}{u_{\text{sup}}^0} d_h(s(\boldsymbol{\xi})), & \xi_2 + \frac{l}{2} - \frac{u_{\text{sup}}^0}{2} \geq 0 \\ \frac{4c}{u_{\text{sup}}^0} d_h(s(\boldsymbol{\xi})), & \xi_2 + \frac{l}{2} - \frac{u_{\text{sup}}^0}{2} < 0 \end{cases},$$

$$d_h(s) := \begin{cases} (-3s + \frac{9}{4}), & 0 \leq s \leq 1, \\ \frac{3}{4}(2-s)^2, & 1 < s \leq 2, \\ 0, & s > 2. \end{cases}$$

We fix $u_{\text{sup}}^0 = 2$ and choose $\boldsymbol{\mu} = c \in \mathcal{P} := [1, 2]$ as parameter (vector). Central finite differences are used for the spatial discretization and the system is transformed into a first order ODE. This leads to the Hamiltonian system

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{x}(t; \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathbb{J}_{2N} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}(t; \boldsymbol{\mu}); \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathbb{J}_{2N} \mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \mathbf{x}(t; \boldsymbol{\mu}), \quad \mathbf{x}(0; \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathbf{x}_0(\boldsymbol{\mu}), \quad (40)$$

where

$$\mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\mu}^2 (\mathbf{D}_{\xi_1 \xi_1} + \mathbf{D}_{\xi_2 \xi_2}) & \mathbf{0}_N \\ \mathbf{0}_N & \mathbf{I}_N \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\mathbf{x}_0(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = [u^0(\boldsymbol{\xi}_1), \dots, u^0(\boldsymbol{\xi}_N), v^0(\boldsymbol{\xi}_1), \dots, v^0(\boldsymbol{\xi}_N)]$$

with $\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset \Omega$ being the grid points. We denote the three-point central difference approximations in ξ_1 -direction and in ξ_2 -direction with the positive definite matrices $\mathbf{D}_{\xi_1 \xi_1} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ and $\mathbf{D}_{\xi_2 \xi_2} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$. Here, the generalized position and generalized momentum are the displacement at each grid point and the velocity at each grid point. The number of grid points including boundary points in ξ_1 is chosen as $N_{\xi_1} = 50$ and the number of grid points in ξ_2 -direction is chosen as $N_{\xi_2} = 300$. The grid points are distributed equidistantly along each axis. This results in a Hamiltonian system of dimension of $2N = 15000$ with Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \mathbf{x}.$$

The implicit midpoint rule is a symplectic integrator [31] that preserves quadratic Hamiltonians. Moreover, we choose it with $n_t = 1500$ equidistant time steps for temporal discretization. Since $t_{\text{end}}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is parameter dependent this leads to different time step sizes for different parameters. The parameters $\boldsymbol{\mu}_j = 1 + 0.1j$, $j = 0, \dots, 10$ are used for the computation of the snapshot matrix $\mathbf{X}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{15000 \times 16500}$. For the first experiment we compare the projection errors

$$e_{\text{proj}}(\mathbf{V}) = \|\mathbf{X}_s - \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{X}_s\|_F^2$$

of the rcSVD bases $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times k}$ for $k = 10, 20, 40, 80, 160$, $q_{\text{pow}} = 0, 2, 5$, and $p_{\text{ovs}} = 5, 20, l - k$ with $l = 4(\sqrt{k} + \sqrt{8 \log(kn_s)})^2 \log(k)$. We further include the projection error of the cSVD basis for comparison of the approximation quality and present the results in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Projection error for different values for p_{ovs} and q_{pow}

We observe that the rcSVD yields a very good approximation for all tested values of q_{pow} and p_{ovs} . Especially when choosing $q_{\text{pow}} > 0$ the projection errors are almost equal to the projection error of cSVD. For $q_{\text{pow}} = 0$ we observe that increasing p_{ovs} slightly improves the projection error $e_{\text{proj}}(\mathbf{V})$. For higher values of q_{pow} no influence of p_{ovs} on the error can be observed since it equals the best approximation error of cSVD already for $p_{\text{ovs}} = 5$. Therefore, we conclude that in practice much smaller values for p_{ovs} than $p_{\text{ovs}} = l - k$ with $l = 4(\sqrt{k} + \sqrt{8 \log(kn_s)})^2 \log(k)$ can be used.

In order to highlight the computational advantages of the randomized algorithms, we present the average runtimes (averaged over 5 runs each) in Figure 2. They are measured on a computer with 64 GB RAM and a 13th Gen Intel i7-13700K processor. The experiments are implemented in Python 3.8.10 using numpy 1.24.3 and scipy 1.10.1.




Figure 2: Runtimes for different values for p_{ovs} and q_{pow}

We observe that the rcSVD is highly efficient if p_{ovs} is chosen as a small value that is independent from k . Choosing p_{ovs} as suggested by Theorems 1 and 2 to obtain theoretical guarantees also yields an advantage regarding the use of computational resources but only for small basis sizes and small values of q_{pow} as this k -dependent choice of p_{ovs} drastically increases the runtime especially for larger values of k compared to the runtimes for $p_{ovs} = 5, 20$. In practice these small values for p_{ovs} also result in very good approximations as we saw in Figure 1 compared to cSVD while requiring less than 5% of the computational costs.

For the next experiment we compute the effectivities

$$eff_{\det} = \frac{e_{\text{proj}}(\mathbf{V})}{\eta_{\det}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{\Omega}, k)}, \quad eff_{\det}^{\text{adv}} = \frac{e_{\text{proj}}(\mathbf{V})}{\eta_{\det}^{\text{adv}}(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{\Omega}, k, q_{\text{pow}})}$$

for the deterministic error bounds

$$\eta_{\text{det}}(\mathbf{X}_s, \boldsymbol{\Omega}, k) = \left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_2\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1^\dagger\|_2^2}\right) \sqrt{\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2}$$

$$\eta_{\text{det}}^{\text{adv}}(\mathbf{X}_s, \boldsymbol{\Omega}, k, q_{\text{pow}}) = \sqrt{\left(\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2\right) + \alpha^2 \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_2\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1^\dagger\|_2^2}$$

where with the superscript *adv*, we denote the advanced error bound that also takes the number of power iterations into account. The effectivity measures the extent of overestimation of the error bounds. Ideally, the effectivity is close to or even equal to one. An effectivity larger than one corresponds to overestimation and an effectivity lower than one means, that the error is underestimated, i.e., it is not bounded. Note, that these error bounds are expensive to evaluate since the singular values and singular vectors of the snapshot matrix are required. For efficient error estimation for example in combination with adaptive basis generation, error estimation techniques like in [32] or [33] have to be applied. We present average results over 5 runs (i.e., 5 draws of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$) in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Effectivity of deterministic error bound for different values of p_{ows} and q_{pow}

We observe that $eff_{\text{det}}^{\text{adv}}$ is very close to one for small values of k with an increasing factor of overestimation the higher k is chosen. Further, $\eta_{\text{det}}^{\text{adv}}$ gets sharper the higher

q_{pow} and p_{ovs} are chosen. Also eff_{det} becomes closer to one the higher p_{ovs} is chosen. However the value of q_{pow} does not influence eff_{det} . For $q_{\text{pow}} = 0$ and $p_{\text{ovs}} = 5$ both bounds roughly have the same extent of overestimation i.e., the blue curves are close together. For increasing values of q_{pow} and p_{ovs} the advances bound gets sharper, i.e., the dotted lines are closer to one than the solid lines.

For the next experiment we compute the effectivities

$$\text{eff}_{\text{prob}} = \frac{e_{\text{proj}}(\mathbf{V})}{\eta_{\text{prob}}(\mathbf{X}_s, k, p_{\text{ovs}})}, \quad \text{eff}_{\text{prob}}^{\text{adv}} = \frac{e_{\text{proj}}(\mathbf{V})}{\eta_{\text{prob}}^{\text{adv}}(\mathbf{X}_s, k, p_{\text{ovs}}, q_{\text{pow}})}$$

for the probabilistic error bounds

$$\eta_{\text{prob}}(\mathbf{X}_s, k, p_{\text{ovs}}) := \left(1 + \sqrt{1 + 6n_s/(k + p_{\text{ovs}})}\right) \sqrt{\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2}$$

$$\eta_{\text{prob}}^{\text{adv}}(\mathbf{X}_s, k, p_{\text{ovs}}, q_{\text{pow}}) := \sqrt{\left(\sum_{j \geq k+1} \sigma_j^2\right) + \alpha^2 6n_s/(k + p_{\text{ovs}})}.$$




Figure 4: Effectivity of probabilistic error bound for different values of p_{ovs} and q_{pow}

By Theorems 1 and 2, the failure probability of the two bounds is $2/k$ for $p_{\text{ovs}} = l - k$, which is for the values of k considered here between 20% for $k = 10$ and 1.25% for $k = 160$. However, we observe in Figure 4 where we present average results over 5 runs (i.e., 5 draws of Ω) that in practice the effectivities are not lower than one. Note, that we compute the effectivities also for $p_{\text{ovs}} = 5, 20$ where the assumption $p_{\text{ovs}} \geq l - k$ does not hold. Nevertheless, we observe that also in this case the effectivities are greater or equal than one. Moreover, we realize that the assumption $p_{\text{ovs}} \geq k - l$ is needed in Proposition 1 as we observe that the effectivities of the probabilistic bounds are sometimes lower than the effectivities of the deterministic bounds for $p_{\text{ovs}} = 5, 20$. We further observe that $eff_{\text{prob}}^{\text{adv}}$ gets closer to one the higher q_{pow} and p_{ovs} are chosen and similarly eff_{prob} becomes close to one the higher p_{ovs} is chosen.

7 Conclusion and Outlook

In this work, we presented two probabilistic error bounds for the rcSVD basis generation procedure that depend on the choice of two hyperparameters. With a certain probability which depends on the basis size a suitable choice leads to the projection error of the rcSVD being at most a constant factor worse than the projection error of the cSVD, i.e., the rcSVD being quasi-optimal in the set of ortho-symplectic matrices. However, the numerical experiments showed that the resulting choice for the oversampling parameter p_{ovs} required for having these guarantees is only useful if $k + p_{\text{ovs}} \ll n_s$. In practice, smaller values for p_{ovs} also work very well where we do not have probabilistic bounds. Moreover, we learn from Theorem 2 that the performance of the rcSVD algorithm depends on the quotient $(\sigma_k / \sigma_{k+p_{\text{ovs}}+1})^{q_{\text{pow}}}$. One option for future work is applying (randomized) error estimates for the projection error and combining them with adaptive randomized basis generation. Future work will also deal with error analysis of the rSVD-like-algorithm [23], a randomized version of the SVD-like decomposition [34, 3]. Another option for future work is the analysis of different complex sketching matrices, i.e., bounding the norms of Ω_1, Ω_2 for other random distributions. Furthermore, our implementation could be adapted and tested on different hardware (e.g. multicore architectures), as random sketching techniques are easily parallelizable and therefore well suited to modern computing architectures.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare no competing interests.

Data availability

The code for the experiments is openly available at doi.org/10.18419/darus-4185.

Acknowledgements

Supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) Project No. 314733389, and under Germany's Excellence Strategy - EXC 2075 - 390740016. We acknowledge the support by the Stuttgart Center for Simulation Science (SimTech).

References

- [1] K. R. Meyer, D. C. Offin, Introduction to Hamiltonian Dynamical Systems and the N-Body Problem, Vol. 90 of Applied Mathematical Sciences, Springer International Publishing AG, New York, NY, 2017. doi:10.1137/1035155.
- [2] S. Volkwein, Proper orthogonal decomposition: Theory and reduced-order modelling, Lecture Notes, University of Konstanz (2013). URL <https://www.math.uni-konstanz.de/numerik/personen/volkwein/teaching/POD-Book.pdf>
- [3] P. Buchfink, A. Bhatt, B. Haasdonk, Symplectic model order reduction with non-orthonormal bases, Mathematical and Computational Applications 24 (2) (2019). doi:10.3390/mca24020043.
- [4] B. Maboudi Afkham, J. S. Hesthaven, Structure preserving model reduction of parametric Hamiltonian systems, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing 39 (6) (2017) A2616–A2644. doi:10.1137/17M1111991.
- [5] L. Peng, K. Mohseni, Symplectic model reduction of Hamiltonian systems, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing 38 (1) (2016) A1–A27. doi:10.1137/140978922.
- [6] N. Halko, P.-G. Martinsson, J. A. Tropp, Finding structure with randomness: Probabilistic algorithms for constructing approximate matrix decompositions, SIAM Review 53 (2) (2011) 217–288. doi:10.1137/090771806.
- [7] M. W. Mahoney, Randomized algorithms for matrices and data, Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning 3 (2) (2011) 123–224. doi:10.1561/22000000035.
- [8] D. P. Woodruff, Sketching as a tool for numerical linear algebra, Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science 10 (1–2) (2014) 1–157. doi:10.1561/04000000060.
- [9] R. Murray, J. Demmel, M. W. Mahoney, N. B. Erichson, M. Melnichenko, O. A. Malik, L. Grigori, P. Luszczyk, M. Dereziński, M. E. Lopes, T. Liang, H. Luo, J. Dongarra, Randomized numerical linear algebra: A perspective on the field with an eye to software, arXiv preprint (2023). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.11474>
- [10] C. Boutsidis, P. Drineas, P. Kambadur, E.-M. Kontopoulou, A. Zouzias, A randomized algorithm for approximating the log determinant of a symmetric positive definite matrix, Linear Algebra and its Applications 533 (2017) 95–117. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2017.07.004.
- [11] O. Balabanov, L. Grigori, Randomized Gram–Schmidt process with application to GMRES, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing 44 (3) (2022) A1450–A1474. doi:10.1137/20M138870X.
- [12] M. Meier, Y. Nakatsukasa, Fast randomized numerical rank estimation for numerically low-rank matrices, Linear Algebra and its Applications 686 (2024) 1–32. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2024.01.001.
- [13] H. Li, S. Yin, Single-pass randomized algorithms for LU decomposition, Linear Algebra and its Applications 595 (2020) 101–122. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2020.03.001.

- [14] J. Demmel, L. Grigori, A. Rusciano, An improved analysis and unified perspective on deterministic and randomized low-rank matrix approximation, *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* 44 (2) (2023) 559–591. doi:10.1137/21M1391316.
- [15] A. Alla, J. N. Kutz, Randomized model order reduction, *Advances in Computational Mathematics* 45 (2019) 1251–1271. doi:10.1007/s10444-018-09655-9.
- [16] C. Bach, D. Ceglia, L. Song, F. Duddeck, Randomized low-rank approximation methods for projection-based model order reduction of large nonlinear dynamical problems, *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* 118 (4) (2019) 209–241. doi:10.1002/nme.6009.
- [17] A. Hochman, J. F. Villena, A. G. Polimeridis, L. M. Silveira, J. K. White, L. Daniel, Reduced-order models for electromagnetic scattering problems, *IEEE transactions on antennas and propagation* 62 (6) (2014) 3150–3162. doi:10.1109/TAP.2014.2314734.
- [18] A. Buhr, K. Smetana, Randomized local model order reduction, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 40 (4) (2018) A2120–A2151. doi:10.1137/17M1138480.
- [19] O. Zahm, A. Nouy, Interpolation of inverse operators for preconditioning parameter-dependent equations, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 38 (2) (2016) A1044–A1074. doi:10.1137/15M1019210.
- [20] O. Balabanov, A. Nouy, Randomized linear algebra for model reduction. Part I: Galerkin methods and error estimation, *Advances in Computational Mathematics* 45 (5) (2019) 2969–3019. doi:10.1007/s10444-019-09725-6.
- [21] O. Balabanov, A. Nouy, Randomized linear algebra for model reduction—part II: minimal residual methods and dictionary-based approximation, *Advances in Computational Mathematics* 47 (2) (2021) 26. doi:10.1007/s10444-020-09836-5.
- [22] J. Schleich, K. Smetana, L. ter Maat, Randomized quasi-optimal local approximation spaces in time, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 45 (3) (2023) A1066–A1096. doi:10.1137/22M1481002.
- [23] R. Herkert, P. Buchfink, B. Haasdonk, J. Rettberg, J. Fehr, Randomized symplectic model order reduction for Hamiltonian systems, in: *LSSC Proceedings 2023*, 2023. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-56208-2_9.
- [24] P. Benner, S. Grivet-Talocia, A. Quarteroni, G. Rozza, W. Schilders, L. M. Silveira, Model order reduction, snapshot-based methods and algorithms, *De Gruyter*, 2 (2020). doi:10.1515/9783110671490.
- [25] P. Benner, M. Ohlberger, A. Cohen, K. Willcox, *Model Reduction and Approximation*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 2017. doi:10.1137/1.9781611974829.
- [26] P. Benner, S. Gugercin, K. Willcox, A survey of projection-based model reduction methods for parametric dynamical systems, *SIAM Review* 57 (4) (2015) 483–531. doi:10.1137/130932715.
- [27] A. C. da Silva, *Lectures on Symplectic Geometry*, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-45330-7.

- [28] J. A. Tropp, Improved analysis of the subsampled randomized Hadamard transform, *Advances in Adaptive Data Analysis* 3 (2011) 115–126. doi:10.1142/S1793536911000787.
- [29] M. Gu, Subspace iteration randomization and singular value problems, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 37 (3) (2015) A1139–A1173. doi:10.1137/130938700.
- [30] R. Herkert, P. Buchfink, B. Haasdonk, Dictionary-based online-adaptive structure-preserving model order reduction for Hamiltonian systems, *Advances in Computational Mathematics* 50 (1) (2024) 12. doi:10.1007/s10444-023-10102-7.
- [31] E. Hairer, M. Hochbruck, A. Iserles, C. Lubich, Geometric numerical integration, *Oberwolfach Reports* 3 (1) (2006) 805–882. doi:10.1007/3-540-30666-8.
- [32] J. Rettberg, D. Wittwar, P. Buchfink, R. Herkert, J. Fehr, B. Haasdonk, Improved a posteriori error bounds for reduced port-Hamiltonian systems, arXiv preprint (2023). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.17329>
- [33] K. Smetana, O. Zahm, A. T. Patera, Randomized residual-based error estimators for parametrized equations, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 41 (2) (2019) A900–A926. doi:10.1137/18M120364X.
- [34] H. Xu, An SVD-like matrix decomposition and its applications, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 368 (2003) 1–24. doi:/10.1016/S0024-3795(03)00370-7.