

Generalizing Reduced Rank Extrapolation to Low-Rank Matrix Sequences

Pascal den Boef ^{*} Patrick Kürschner [†] Xiaobo Liu [‡]
 Jos Maubach^{*} Jens Saak [‡] Wil Schilders ^{*}
 Jonas Schulze [‡] Nathan van de Wouw ^{*}

^{*}*Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, Netherlands.*

[†]*Leipzig University of Applied Sciences, Leipzig, Germany.*

[‡]*Max Planck Institute for Dynamics of Complex Technical Systems, Magdeburg, Germany.*

Abstract: Reduced rank extrapolation (RRE) is an acceleration method typically used to accelerate the iterative solution of nonlinear systems of equations using a fixed-point process. In this context, the iterates are vectors generated from a fixed-point mapping function. However, when considering the iterative solution of large-scale matrix equations, the iterates are low-rank matrices generated from a fixed-point process for which, generally, the mapping function changes in each iteration. To enable acceleration of the iterative solution for these problems, we propose two novel generalizations of RRE. First, we show how to effectively compute RRE for sequences of low-rank matrices. Second, we derive a formulation of RRE that is suitable for fixed-point processes for which the mapping function changes each iteration. We demonstrate the potential of the methods on several numerical examples involving the iterative solution of large-scale Lyapunov and Riccati matrix equations.

Keywords: Extrapolation methods, Reduced rank extrapolation (RRE), Fixed-point iteration, Nonlinear equations, Large scale matrix equations, Cycling mode

Mathematics subject classification: 65B05, 65H05, 15A24, 39B12

Novelty statement: We propose novel extensions of RRE for the iterative solution of large-scale sparse matrix equations: I) A scheme to efficiently implement RRE for low-rank matrix iterates; and II) A scheme to apply RRE for iterates generated by nonstationary fixed-point processes of the form (1.3).

1. Introduction

RRE was first introduced in [14, 22]. RRE (and other vector extrapolation methods) can be considered as general techniques to find the limit (or anti-limit) of a sequence of vectors $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. However, they are most often applied in and analyzed based on the scenario that the iterates are generated by a fixed-point process f , i.e.,

$$x_{i+1} = f(x_i) \tag{1.1}$$

with $i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and x_1 given. These scenarios arise most notably when considering the iterative solution of the nonlinear system of equations (which describe a fixed point of (1.1))

$$\mathcal{F}(x) = 0. \tag{1.2}$$

However, the assumption that the iterates are generated by the process (1.1) may not always hold. In particular, we consider two scenarios under which this is the case:

1. If the iterates are (possibly low-rank) matrices $\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ with $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ given in a factorized form, which shall be retained during the iteration.
2. If the iterates are generated by a fixed-point process that (although it still converges to a fixed-point $x_i \rightarrow x$) is now nonstationary:

$$x_{i+1} = f_i(x_i), \quad (1.3)$$

with $x = f_i(x)$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$, and x a fixed point.

We will now discuss in more detail when these scenarios appear. First, we consider the case that the iterates are matrices. Similar to how vector iterates $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ are associated with the iterative (vector) solution to the nonlinear system (1.2), matrix iterates $\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$ are associated with the iterative (matrix) solution to a matrix equation. Two well-known examples of matrix equations are the Lyapunov and Riccati equations. These equations play a prominent role in various problems in the field of control theory, such as optimal control, model reduction and state estimation; see, e.g., [46, Section 3] and references therein.

Second, we consider the case that the iterates are generated by a nonstationary fixed-point process of the form (1.3). This scenario occurs when we are iteratively solving a system of equations using a different preconditioner at every step, such as considered in [35]. In that work, the author proposes an extension to generalized minimal residual method (GMRES) called flexible GMRES (F-GMRES) which is more flexible in the sense that a different preconditioner at every step is supported. Similarly, in this paper, we extend RRE to a flexible variant that supports nonstationary fixed-point processes of the form (1.3) (see Section 3.2).

There are practical applications in which both of the above scenarios occur simultaneously, for example, when iteratively solving large-scale continuous-time Lyapunov equations using the alternating directions implicit (ADI) method [25, 32, 38]. The first formulation of the ADI that iterates the residual alongside is shown in [7] and [50] show its reinterpretation in the Krylov subspace projection setting. Both, pointing the way to a generalization for Riccati equations: the RADI [4]. The scenarios above also occur for this algorithm. For the ADI and RADI methods, the nonstationarity of the fixed-point process arises because the continuous-time equation is, at each step of the iterative process, transformed into a discrete-time problem. This transformation is parameterized by a shift parameter which, in general, is different for every iteration. As a result, the entire solution process can be viewed as an iterative process of the form (1.3) where, both, the iterates are low-rank matrices *and* the generating process changes in each iteration.

Matrix-oriented versions of Krylov subspace methods, such as F-GMRES, have been used to solve large-scale Lyapunov and generalized (multiterm) Sylvester equations in, e.g., [13, 31, 47]. RRE has been applied in the context of large-scale matrix equations arising in transport theory in [16]. The authors consider nonsymmetric algebraic Riccati equations where the coefficients have a special structure that is found in transport problems such as radiation transfer. This structure allows the solution X to be computed by the Hadamard product of a given matrix T and the outer product of two vectors u, v :

$$X = T \circ (uv^T). \quad (1.4)$$

The authors subsequently apply RRE to an iterative process on u, v . Their numerical experiments show that RRE significantly speeds up the standard iterative process, illustrating the potential of extrapolation methods in the context of matrix equations. In our work, we will focus our attention on matrix equations for which the solution does not need to be of the structure (1.4), but for which the solution admits an effective low-rank approximation.

Acceleration methods, such as RRE, are a useful tool in the iterative solutions of nonlinear (vector) equations. RRE has not yet been studied in the context of general large-scale sparse matrix equations. To enable the application of RRE to such problems, this paper introduces the following contributions:

1. A scheme to efficiently implement RRE for low-rank matrix iterates.
2. A scheme to apply RRE for iterates generated by nonstationary fixed-point processes of the form (1.3).

1.1. Notation

Throughout the paper, we use \cdot^\top to denote real transposition. $\|\cdot\|$ may denote the spectral or Frobenius norm if the argument is a matrix, and the Euclidean norm if the argument is a vector. $|\cdot|$ denotes the absolute value of a scalar. Let $\mathbf{1}$ denote the vector of all ones. $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$ is the set of positive integers, $\mathbb{R}_{<0}$ is the negative real axis (excluding the origin), and $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is the set of real-valued m -by- n matrices. ε denotes the machine precision in IEEE double precision floating-point arithmetic.

1.2. Structure

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we briefly introduce the formulation of RRE that is commonly used in literature. The generalization of this formulation is presented in Section 3, with its application to solving large-scale matrix equations subsequently discussed in Section 3.3. In Section 4, we demonstrate the potential of the method on several numerical examples of large-scale matrix equations. Finally, we provide conclusions and an outlook in Section 5.

2. Preliminaries on RRE

The method of RRE was introduced independently in [14, 22, 28]. In this section, we give a brief derivation of the method in the context of solving the linear system

$$Ax = b. \quad (2.1)$$

The extension of RRE to the more general case of iteratively solving the nonlinear system (1.2) is simple in the sense that the method and algorithm stay the same (although convergence guarantees are no longer easy to derive). We assume that A is regular, i.e., system (2.1) permits a unique solution.

In many applications, the matrix A is too large to explicitly store A or form its inverse A^{-1} . Instead, only the result of Ay for a given vector y may be computed. In that case, one could attempt to find the solution x by iterating the general linear fixed-point procedure

$$\begin{aligned} x_{i+1} = f(x_i) &:= M^{-1}(Nx_i + b) \\ &= x_i - M^{-1}(Ax_i - b) \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

with $A = M - N$ and an initial vector x_1 . The final formulation is often referred to as the second normal form of a consistent linear iteration [18, Section 2.2.2]. There are two practical issues associated with the fixed-point iteration (2.2). First, the iteration (2.2) converges if and only if the eigenvalues of $M^{-1}N$ are on the open unit disk [17, Section 11.2.3]. Second, even if the spectral radius of $M^{-1}N$ is strictly less than 1, the convergence of the iteration (2.2) can be slow when the radius is close to 1. The method of RRE can solve both these issues, provided that most eigenvalues of $M^{-1}N$ have modulus sufficiently small (we will make this statement more precise in the sequel).

At this point, there are two notions of a residual: the residual of the underlying equation (2.1),

$$\widetilde{\text{res}}(y) := \mathcal{F}(y) = b - Ay, \quad (2.3)$$

and the residual of the fixed-point iteration (2.2),

$$\text{res}(y) := f(y) - y = M^{-1}\widetilde{\text{res}}(y). \quad (2.4)$$

Clearly, we have that $\widetilde{\text{res}}(x) = \text{res}(x) = 0$ for the solution x of (2.1). Most derivations of RRE are only concerned with the case $M = I$, for which both these notions of the residual coincide, e.g., [14, 28, 40, 41, 44], or with the residual of the iteration (2.4), e.g., [22, 43]. For the moment, we only consider the case that $\widetilde{\text{res}}(\cdot) = \text{res}(\cdot)$ everywhere.¹

¹We will lift this restriction in Section 3.2.

The main idea of extrapolation methods in general is to construct an extrapolant \hat{x} that is a linear combination of n (which is fixed) iterates $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$, i.e.,

$$\hat{x} = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x_i, \quad (2.5)$$

for some weights γ_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$. Extrapolation methods (such as RRE) differ in the method used to determine these weights. For RRE, the weights are chosen to minimize the residual (2.4) of a convex combination of iterates,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= \arg \min_{g \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\| \text{res} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n g_i x_i \right) \right\| \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n g_i = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

The convexity constraint imposed on the weights γ_i ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i = 1, \quad (2.7)$$

is an assumption that is shared by almost all extrapolation methods (not just vector extrapolation) using linear combinations of iterates [42, Section 0.3]. The consequence of this assumption is that the extrapolation method becomes shift-independent. That is, shifting all iterates by some constant term \bar{x} also shifts the extrapolant by \bar{x} . Furthermore, due to (2.7), it is easy to verify that

$$\widetilde{\text{res}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \widetilde{\text{res}}(x_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{res} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \text{res}(x_i) \quad (2.8)$$

hold; irrespective of M . By the observation that $\text{res}(x_i) = x_{i+1} - x_i$, we can thus write the extrapolant's residual as

$$\text{res} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i (x_{i+1} - x_i). \quad (2.9)$$

Note that in the final term of the sum ($i = n$), we need the additional term x_{n+1} to evaluate $\text{res}(x_i)$. This final term is used commonly in literature to express the basic optimization step involved in RRE [16, 22, 43]:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= \arg \min_{g \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n g_i (x_{i+1} - x_i) \right\| \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n g_i = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

The optimization (2.10) is convex and can be solved efficiently using a QR-decomposition as outlined in [41]. Once solved, the coefficients γ are used to obtain the extrapolant (2.5). We summarize this procedure in Algorithm 1.

2.1. Application modes

In extrapolation methods, typically the extrapolation step is applied multiple times according to the application mode. We will here introduce two such application modes.

The first application mode we discuss is the *non-cycling* RRE mode (Algorithm 2). In this mode, we compute (for fixed window size n) a sequence $\hat{x}_n, \hat{x}_{n+1}, \dots$, until convergence is achieved. This mode can be used in a non-intrusive context in the sense that it does not require knowledge of the underlying process generating these iterates. This is a necessity, for example, in the case of sequences that are generated using commercial software. The non-cycling RRE mode is referred to as n -Mode in [43]. For the scalar case, this mode is similar to Aitken's Δ^2 method [1] in the sense

Algorithm 1: RRE for stationary processes (1.1) in standard formulation (2.10)

Input: Iterates x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1} .
Output: Extrapolant \hat{x} .

- 1 **Function** $\text{RRE}_\Delta(x_1, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1})$ **is**
- 2 | Initialize matrix of differences $U \leftarrow [x_2 - x_1 | \dots | x_{n+1} - x_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$
- 3 | $\gamma \leftarrow \text{RRE}(U)$
- 4 | $\hat{x} \leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x_i$
- 5 **end**
- 6 **Function** $\text{RRE}(U)$ **is**
- 7 | Compute $R \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ of economy-size QR-decomposition $U = QR$
- 8 | Solve $R^\top R \alpha = \mathbf{1}$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$
- 9 | $\gamma \leftarrow \alpha / \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i$
- 10 | **return** γ
- 11 **end**

Algorithm 2: Non-cycling RRE mode

Input: Initialization x_1 , window size $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$.
Output: Extrapolated sequence (of extrapolated iterates only) $\hat{x}_n, \hat{x}_{n+1}, \dots$

- 1 **for** $i \leftarrow 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
- 2 | $x_{i+1} \leftarrow f(x_i)$
- 3 | **if** $i \geq n$ **then**
- 4 | | $\hat{x}_i \leftarrow \text{RRE}_\Delta(x_{i-n+1}, \dots, x_i, x_{i+1})$
- 5 | | **if** \hat{x}_i converged **then** break
- 6 | **end**
- 7 **end**

Algorithm 3: Cycling RRE mode

Input: Initialization x_1 , window size $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$.
Output: Extrapolated sequence x_1, x_2, \dots

- 1 **for** $i \leftarrow 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
- 2 | $x_{i+1} \leftarrow f(x_i)$
- 3 | **if** should start new cycle **then** $x_{i+1} \leftarrow \text{RRE}_\Delta(x_{i-n+1}, \dots, x_i, x_{i+1})$
- 4 | **if** x_{i+1} converged **then** break
- 5 **end**

that a window (of fixed size) is shifted over the sequence of iterates to produce another sequence of iterates.

For some problems, the non-cycling scheme only provides a modest speed up in terms of convergence rate. To improve this, a second application mode can be used: *cycling* RRE mode (Algorithm 3). In each cycle, the fixed-point iteration (1.1) is initialized using the extrapolant of the previous cycle. Since the extrapolant is used to restart the fixed-point process, the mapping f must be known. A new cycle may start, for example, if n divides i (line 3). Some convergence properties of cycling RRE mode for the iterative solutions of nonlinear equations are studied in [43].

2.2. Connections to other iterative methods

Finally, we remark that in the case of solving linear systems using iterative methods, there exist strong connections between these application modes of vector extrapolation and other iterative methods. In the context of Krylov subspace methods, it was shown in [40] that cycling, respectively non-cycling, RRE is equivalent to the restarted, respectively non-restarted, method of generalized minimal residuals (GMR). Several (mathematically equivalent) implementations of GMR have been proposed in literature such as in [2, 15, 51] and the commonly used GMRES [36]. RRE is also equivalent to the method of direction inversion of the iterative subspace (DIIS) which was first proposed in [33] to accelerate the iterative solutions of linear systems of equations. An improved version focused on the self-consistent field (SCF) method is given in [34]. The numerical properties of several implementations of DIIS are compared in [39].

3. Methodological extensions of RRE

In this section, we discuss two extensions to RRE that make it suitable for iterative solvers for large-scale matrix equations: I) In Section 3.1, we treat the case that the iterates consist of low-rank matrices; and II) In Section 3.2, we treat the case that the iterates are generated from a fixed-point iteration with nonstationary mapping (1.3).

These two extensions are generic in nature and can be applied independently. Nevertheless, in Section 3.3 we discuss in more detail the application of RRE with both extensions to the important case of iteratively solving large-scale matrix equations.

3.1. RRE for low-rank matrix sequences

Similar to how RRE is used to accelerate the iterative solutions of systems with vector solutions, we are interested in accelerating the iterative solution of the matrix-valued system

$$\mathcal{F}(X) = 0. \quad (3.1)$$

We assume that a solution $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ exists and is symmetric. The symmetry assumption is for convenience of notation only: the method can be extended to the non-symmetric case as will be briefly discussed at the end of this section. The function $\mathcal{F} : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ in equation (3.1) may be nonlinear. We assume that a direct solution for the system (3.1) cannot be obtained (for example, because the computational load is too high). Instead, we consider an iterative solution process by the fixed-point iteration:

$$X_{i+1} = F(X_i) \quad (3.2)$$

with initialization X_1 and $F : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. Note that convergence of the iteration (3.2) to X depends on F and the initialization. For example, for the matrix equations we consider in this article, convergence is guaranteed under mild technical assumptions (which will be discussed further in Section 3.3).

One immediate possibility is to apply RRE to the vectorized sequence of matrices $\{\text{vec}(X_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}}$, where $\text{vec}(\cdot)$ stacks the columns of its argument into a vector. However, this is not possible for large-scale problems where the iterates are too large (i.e., d is too large) to fit in memory. Instead, iterative solvers of large-scale matrix equations, such as RADI, exploit the fact that, for many

practical problems, the desired solution can be well-approximated by a low-rank matrix [3]. Such solvers produce low-rank iterates in factorized form:

$$X_i = Z_i D_i Z_i^T, \quad (3.3)$$

with $Z_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times z_i}$, $D_i = D_i^T \in \mathbb{R}^{z_i \times z_i}$ and $z_i \ll d$. Algorithmically, the fixed-point iteration (3.2) is implemented by only operating on the low-rank factors (for example, ADI and RADI). That is, conceptually,

$$(Z_{i+1}, D_{i+1}) = F(Z_i, D_i), \quad (3.4)$$

where potentially $z_{i+1} \neq z_i$.

Substituting the low-rank decomposition (3.3) into the formulation of vector RRE (2.10) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= \arg \min_{g \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n g_i (Z_{i+1} D_{i+1} Z_{i+1}^T - Z_i D_i Z_i^T) \right\| \\ \text{s.t. } &\sum_{i=1}^n g_i = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is now a matrix norm.

Solving this optimization problem, again, gives us a set of weights γ for which a low-rank decomposition of the extrapolant can be constructed:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{X} &:= \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i Z_i D_i Z_i^T \\ &= [Z_1 \quad \cdots \quad Z_n] \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1 D_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \gamma_n D_n \end{bmatrix} [Z_1 \quad \cdots \quad Z_n]^T =: \widehat{Z} \widehat{D} \widehat{Z}^T. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

The rank of the extrapolant is at most $\sum_{i=1}^n z_i$. Depending on the problem, the rank can be significantly lower than this because the columns of \widehat{Z} may be linearly dependent. For example, in ADI and RADI, we have that $\text{range}(Z_i) \subseteq \text{range}(Z_{i+1})$ (see [4, eq. (12)]). Hence, for these methods the rank of the extrapolant is at most z_n .

From a computational point of view, solving the optimization problem (3.5) is usually not feasible because the problem size d is so large that we are unable to assemble $X_1, \dots, X_{n+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. However, if we restrict $\|\cdot\|$ to be the Frobenius norm or spectral norm, then we can exploit the following result in developing a computationally scalable solution strategy. We should note that the result has been used without a proof in [32, equation (4.7)].

Lemma 3.1. *For a given $\Delta = \Delta^T \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, let $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times q}$ with $q \leq d$ be a matrix such that $Q^T Q = I_q$ and $\text{range}(\Delta) \subseteq \text{range}(Q)$. Let $\|\cdot\|$ represent either the Frobenius norm or spectral norm. Then,*

$$\|\Delta\| = \|Q^T \Delta Q\|. \quad (3.7)$$

Proof. The equality (3.7) is similar to the classical result that the Frobenius and spectral norms are invariant under orthogonal transformations [10, Section IV.2], [20, Section 7.4.7], [19, Section 6.2], where Q is orthogonal (and hence square). However, we allow Q to be non-square in case of rank deficiency of Δ . In this scenario, this result is a special case of the pinching inequality [11, Theorem 2.7]. Namely, the pinching inequality will hold with equality, which we prove by showing that the singular values of Δ and $Q^T \Delta Q$ coincide. Let $r \leq d$ be the rank of Δ . Then, Δ has an economy-size singular value decomposition of the form

$$\Delta = U \Sigma U^T, \quad (3.8)$$

where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ and $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$. We pre- and post-multiply Δ by Q and its transpose to arrive at

$$Q^T \Delta Q = Q^T U \Sigma (Q^T U)^T, \quad (3.9)$$




Figure 3.1: Schema illustrating the application of RRE to the first 3 low-rank iterates X_1, X_2, X_3 , where the weights τ_1, τ_2 are as in (3.20).

Observe that

$$\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^n g_i V_{i+1} \tilde{D}_{i+1} V_{i+1}^T = [V_2 \ \cdots \ V_{n+1}] \begin{bmatrix} g_1 \tilde{D}_2 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & g_n \tilde{D}_{n+1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V_2^T \\ \vdots \\ V_{n+1}^T \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.17)$$

whose rank is limited by $q := z_{n+1} - z_1 < z_{n+1} < z$. Let $\tilde{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times q}$ and $\tilde{V}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times v_i}$ be given by the thin QR-decomposition

$$[V_2 \ \cdots \ V_{n+1}] = \tilde{Q} [\tilde{V}_2 \ \cdots \ \tilde{V}_{n+1}] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times q}. \quad (3.18)$$

Obviously, $\text{range}(\Delta) \subseteq \text{range}(\tilde{Q})$, and Lemma 3.1 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= \arg \min_{g \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n g_i \tilde{V}_{i+1} \tilde{D}_{i+1} \tilde{V}_{i+1}^T \right\| \\ &\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n g_i = 1, \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

is equivalent to formulation (3.14). Here, all matrix products can be evaluated in $\mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$, and $q < z$.

Figure 3.1 gives a graphical overview on the procedure. In this figure, we also highlight the fact that the iterates are constructed by low-rank updates (3.15). Thus, the extrapolant \hat{X} can be written as a weighted sum of these low-rank updates:

$$\hat{X} = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i X_i = \tau_1 Z_1 D_1 Z_1^T + \sum_{i=2}^n \tau_i V_i \tilde{D}_i V_i^T, \quad (3.20)$$

with $\tau_i = \sum_{j=i}^n \gamma_j$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Algorithm 4 summarizes the resulting procedure as an extension to Algorithm 1. Assuming the iterative process (3.4) reveals an incremental structure (3.15), Algorithm 4 can be applied in any of the two RRE modes shown in Algorithms 2 and 3. The final ingredient is exploiting the

Algorithm 4: RRE for low-rank matrix sequences (3.19)

Input: Iterates X_1, \dots, X_{n+1} given by $Z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times z_1}$ and $D_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{z_1 \times z_1}$ as well as $V_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times v_i}$ and $\tilde{D}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{v_i \times v_i}$ fulfilling (3.3) and (3.15) for $i = 2, \dots, n+1$.

Output: Extrapolant $\hat{X} = \hat{Z}\hat{D}\hat{Z}^\top$.

1 **Function** $\text{RRE}_\Delta^{\text{LR}}(X_1, \dots, X_n, X_{n+1})$ **is**

2 Compute triangular factor of thin QR-decomposition:

$$[V_2 \ \cdots \ V_{n+1}] = \tilde{Q} [\tilde{V}_2 \ \cdots \ \tilde{V}_{n+1}]$$

3 Initialize matrix of differences:

$$U \leftarrow [\text{vec}(\tilde{V}_2 \tilde{D}_2 \tilde{V}_2^\top) \ \cdots \ \text{vec}(\tilde{V}_{n+1} \tilde{D}_{n+1} \tilde{V}_{n+1}^\top)] \in \mathbb{R}^{q^2 \times n}$$

4 Compute weights $\gamma \leftarrow \text{RRE}(U)$

5 Assemble low-rank factors of extrapolant:

$$\hat{Z} \leftarrow Z_n, \quad \hat{D} \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} \tau_1 D_1 & & & \\ & \tau_2 \tilde{D}_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \tau_n \tilde{D}_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where } \tau_i = \sum_{j=i}^n \gamma_j$$

6 **end**

incremental structure (3.15) to more efficiently compute the extrapolant (3.6) as shown in line 5. Note that the first diagonal block of \hat{D} is given by D_1 , the complete inner low-rank factor of X_1 . Optionally, one may remove the low-rank blocks V_i and \tilde{D}_i for which $\tau_i := \sum_{j=i}^n \gamma_j$ is sufficiently close to zero:

$$|\tau_i| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon} \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |\tau_j|. \quad (3.21)$$

3.2. RRE for nonstationary fixed-point processes

Until now, we have considered RRE in the context of *stationary* fixed-point processes of the form (1.1). By stationary, we mean that the fixed-point function f stays the same for all iterations. In this section, we consider *nonstationary* fixed-point processes of the form (1.3). To apply RRE to nonstationary fixed-point processes, one could still use the weights obtained from the standard formulation (2.10). However, as we will see in this section, this strategy can lead to slow convergence. Hence, we propose an alternative formulation and show its improved convergence speed.

To demonstrate the difference between the standard formulation and the alternative formulation, we will consider a simple example of a vector-valued fixed-point process. Ultimately, we are interested in nonstationary fixed-point processes in the context of iterative solution of large-scale matrix equations. In this context, the iterates will be low-rank matrix factorizations instead of vectors. We will further discuss this setting in Section 3.3.

Nonstationary fixed-point processes occur for instance when iteratively solving linear systems using different preconditioners at each step. The F-GMRES introduced in [35] is a generalization of GMRES that is designed for this scenario. An important difference between stationary and nonstationary fixed-point processes is that the two notions of the residual, equations (2.3) and (2.4), do no longer coincide. Worse yet, the residual (2.4) of the iterative process becomes nonstationary as well. That is,

$$\widetilde{\text{res}}(x_i) := b - Ax_i \neq x_{i+1} - x_i = M_i^{-1}(b - Ax_i) =: \text{res}_i(x_i). \quad (3.22)$$

Therefore, we must work with the residual of the underlying equation, $\widetilde{\text{res}}$, as shown in Algorithm 5 (RRE $_{\mathcal{F}}$) as an extension of Algorithm 1.




Figure 3.2: Comparison of RRE using the standard formulation and the proposed formulation on a stationary and nonstationary fixed-point process.

To illustrate the advantage of using $\widetilde{\text{res}}$, we present a numerical example involving the iterative solution of the linear system $Ax = b$ with the well-known successive over-relaxation (SOR) scheme [17, Section 11.2.7], see formula (2.2) with

$$M = M_i = \frac{1}{\omega_i} D_A + L_A \quad \text{and} \quad N = N_i = \left(\frac{1}{\omega_i} - 1 \right) D_A - U_A, \quad (3.23)$$

where L_A , D_A , and U_A denote the strictly lower triangular, diagonal, and strictly upper triangular parts of $A = L_A + D_A + U_A$, respectively, and $0 < \omega_i < 2$. For the underlying equation $Ax = b$, let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{20 \times 20}$ be a tri-diagonal matrix with $1/10$ on the main diagonal and $1/20$ on the sub-diagonals, and set $b = A\mathbf{1} / \|A\mathbf{1}\|$. We initialize the iterative scheme with $x_1 = 0$ and compare three runs:

1. without extrapolation; $(x_{i+1} = f(x_i))$
2. with cycling RRE using the standard formulation (2.10); (RRE_Δ)
3. with cycling RRE using formulation (2.6) but with $\widetilde{\text{res}}(\cdot)$ in place of $\text{res}(\cdot)$. $(\text{RRE}_\mathcal{F})$

The results for RRE setting $n = 8$ are shown in Figure 3.2 for the stationary case ($\omega_i = 0.5$) and the nonstationary case ($\omega_i = 0.5 + 1/10 \sin(0.02\pi i)$). In both scenarios, using the RRE that minimizes the residual of the underlying equation accelerates convergence (fewer than 130 iterations). Using the standard formulation of RRE, on the other hand, illustrates that issues are encountered when the iterates are generated from an nonstationary fixed-point process. Although standard RRE still converges in both cases, it is even slightly ahead of our new formulation for the stationary case until iteration $i = 72$, it is significantly slower for the nonstationary process (329 iterations) than for the stationary process (129 iterations).

Observe that $\text{RRE}_\mathcal{F}$ does not require knowledge about iterate x_{n+1} to extrapolate from iterates x_1, \dots, x_n . Therefore, Algorithms 2 and 3 may be reformulated to compute an extrapolation with one less application of f . We leave this reformulation as an exercise for the reader.

Algorithm 5: RRE for non-stationary processes (1.3)

Input: Iterates x_1, \dots, x_n .
Output: Extrapolant \hat{x} .

```

1 Function RRE $_{\mathcal{F}}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  is
2   | Initialize matrix of residuals  $U \leftarrow [\mathcal{F}(x_1) \ \cdots \ \mathcal{F}(x_n)] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ 
3   |  $\gamma \leftarrow \text{RRE}(U)$ 
4   |  $\hat{x} \leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x_i$ 
5 end

```

3.3. Extension to large-scale matrix equations

The generalization of RRE to low-rank matrices in Section 3.1 and to nonstationary fixed-point iterations in Section 3.2 may be used independently. However, in the important case of iteratively solving large-scale matrix equations we shall require both extensions simultaneously. Hence, in this section we will provide more details of the method in this usage scenario.

We focus on the following algebraic Riccati equation (ARE) with solution $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$:

$$\mathcal{R}(X) := A^\top X E + E^\top X A + C^\top C - E^\top X B H^{-1} B^\top X E = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \quad (3.24)$$

where B and C^\top are thin rectangular matrices and H is symmetric positive definite. The ARE (3.24) reduces to a linear Lyapunov equation whenever $B = 0$. AREs, and its adjoint variants which we do not consider here, are important nonlinear matrix equations that appear in many problems in control theory [21]. In such problems, typically one is only interested in the unique stabilizing solution X such that the spectrum of $(A - B H^{-1} B^\top X E, E)$ is in the open left half plane. The stabilizing solution is guaranteed to exist if (A, E, B) is stabilizable and (A, E, C^\top) is detectable [12, 24]; as cited by [5].

In the literature, there exist many iterative solvers that approximate the stabilizing solution of an ARE with sparse coefficients. A comprehensive overview and comparison of different solvers is given in [5]. In that comparison study, one of the most performant solvers is the RADI method, first described in [4]. In this section, we only give a very brief introduction to the RADI method since our focus is on how to accelerate RADI using the generalizations of RRE derived in the previous sections; see [4] for more details on the full version of RADI.

The iterations of RADI can be described as follows. For a given initialization $X_1 = Z_1 D_1 Z_1^\top$, write the initial residual as $\mathcal{R}(X_1) = R_1 T R_1^\top$ where

$$R_1 := \begin{bmatrix} C^\top & A^\top Z_1 & E^\top Z_1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r},$$

$$T := \begin{bmatrix} I & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & D_1 \\ \cdot & D_1 & -D_1 Z_1^\top B H^{-1} B^\top Z_1 D_1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}, \quad (3.25)$$

compare, e.g., [8]. Subsequent iterates X_2, X_3, \dots (and residuals) may then be determined using the nonstationary RADI iteration map (3.4) shown in Algorithm 6. Note that complex shift parameters (with negative real part) can also be used in RADI, in which case complex arithmetic has to be used, e.g., in computing the low-rank factors V_{i+1} and \tilde{Y}_{i+1} of the increments. [4, Proposition 3] describes how to handle a pair of complex-conjugated shifts at once, reducing the use of complex arithmetic, which is implemented in [37, `mess_lrradi`], but, for simplicity, not reflected in Algorithm 6. However, Algorithm 6 extends [4, formula (12)] to nonzero initializations, $X_1 \neq 0$. Note that the residuals permit $\mathcal{R}(X_i) = R_i T R_i^\top$, where the inner factor T is fixed for all iterations $i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$.

An attractive feature of RADI is that the rank of the residual is bounded from above by r . The initialization X_1 fully determines the maximum rank r . If the spectrum of (A, E) is in the open left half plane, the initialization $X_1 = 0$ is typically used. In this case, the residual factors (3.25) collapse to $R_1 = C^\top$ and $T = I$ and, hence, the rank of the residual is equal to $\text{rank}(C^\top C) = \text{rank}(C)$.

Algorithm 6: RADI iteration map [4, formula (12)] [37, `mess_lrradi` simplified]

Input: Iterate $X_i = Z_i D_i Z_i^\top$ given by $Z_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times z_i}$ and $D_i \in \mathbb{R}^{z_i \times z_i}$.

Residual $\mathcal{R}(X_i) = R_i T R_i^\top$ given by $R_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ and $T \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$.

Output: Iterate $X_{i+1} = Z_{i+1} D_{i+1} Z_{i+1}^\top$ and residual $\mathcal{R}(X_{i+1}) = R_{i+1} T R_{i+1}^\top$.

1 **Function** $F_i(Z_i, D_i, R_i, T)$ **is**

2 Select shift parameter $\sigma_i \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}$

3 Compute outer low-rank factor of increment:

$$V_{i+1} \leftarrow \sqrt{-2\sigma_i} \cdot (A^\top - E^\top Z_i D_i Z_i^\top B H^{-1} B^\top + \sigma_i E^\top)^{-1} R_i T$$

4 Compute inner low-rank factor of increment:

$$\tilde{Y}_{i+1} \leftarrow T - \frac{1}{2\sigma_i} (V_{i+1}^\top B) H^{-1} (V_{i+1}^\top B)^\top \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{D}_{i+1} \leftarrow (\tilde{Y}_{i+1})^{-1}$$

5 Assemble low-rank factors of X_{i+1} :

$$Z_{i+1} \leftarrow [Z_i \quad V_{i+1}] \quad \text{and} \quad D_{i+1} \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} D_i & \\ & \tilde{D}_{i+1} \end{bmatrix}$$

6 Update outer residual factor:

$$R_{i+1} \leftarrow R_i + \sqrt{-2\sigma_i} \cdot E^\top V_{i+1} \tilde{D}_{i+1}$$

7 **end**

Note that another useful property of RADI (as we mentioned in Section 3.1) is that each iterate X_i can be written as a rank- r update of X_{i-1} . In terms of formula (3.15), it is $v_{i+1} := r$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. Hence, the rank of the extrapolant (3.6) is upper bounded by the rank of X_n .

The convergence speed of RADI can depend greatly on an appropriate selection of the shift parameters. Many selection methods are proposed in literature, see, e.g., [4, 5, 45]. However, regardless of the exact shift selection method that is used, the RADI iteration converges to the unique stabilizing positive semi-definite solution of the ARE (3.24), e.g., if the spectrum of (A, E) is in the open left half plane, $X_1 \succeq 0$, $\mathcal{R}(X_1) \succeq 0$ and the shift parameters σ_i satisfy the non-Blaschke condition [27, Theorem 6.1]:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma_i}{1 + |\sigma_i|^2} = -\infty. \quad (3.26)$$

Under this convergence guarantee, Algorithm 6 may be viewed as a matrix version of the nonstationary fixed-point process (1.3):

$$X_{i+1} = F_i(X_i), \quad (3.27)$$

with $F_i(X_i) = X_i + V_{i+1} \tilde{D}_{i+1} V_{i+1}^\top$. The nonstationarity in process (3.27) is the result of allowing different shift parameters σ_k in each iteration. Hence, the results of Section 3.2 suggest that the residual of the ARE (3.24) should be used to find the RRE coefficients. That is, instead of solving the optimization problem (3.5), the matrix version of RRE formulated for stationary fixed-point iterations, we solve

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= \arg \min_{g \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n g_i R_i T R_i^\top \right\| \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n g_i = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

Recall that the Riccati operator $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ is nonlinear, such that this optimization problem only minimizes an approximation of the extrapolant's residual.

Algorithm 7: RRE for nonstationary low-rank matrix sequences (3.28)

Input: Iterates X_1, \dots, X_n given by $Z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times z_1}$ and $D_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{z_1 \times z_1}$ as well as $V_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times v_i}$ and $\tilde{D}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{v_i \times v_i}$ fulfilling (3.3) and (3.15) for $i = 2, \dots, n$.

Residuals $\mathcal{R}(X_i) = R_i T R_i^\top$, where $R_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ and $T \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$.

Output: Extrapolant $\hat{X} = \hat{Z} \hat{D} \hat{Z}^\top$.

1 **Function** $\text{RRE}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{LR}}(X_1, \dots, X_n, R_1, \dots, R_n, T)$ **is**

2 Compute triangular factor of thin QR-decomposition:

$$[R_1 \ \cdots \ R_n] = \tilde{Q} [\tilde{R}_1 \ \cdots \ \tilde{R}_n]$$

3 Initialize matrix of residuals:

$$U \leftarrow [\text{vec}(\tilde{R}_1 T \tilde{R}_1^\top) \ \cdots \ \text{vec}(\tilde{R}_n T \tilde{R}_n^\top)] \in \mathbb{R}^{(nr)^2 \times n}$$

4 Compute weights $\gamma \leftarrow \text{RRE}(U)$

5 Assemble low-rank factors of extrapolant:

$$\hat{Z} \leftarrow Z_n, \quad \hat{D} \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} \tau_1 D_1 & & & \\ & \tau_2 \tilde{D}_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \tau_n \tilde{D}_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where } \tau_i = \sum_{j=i}^n \gamma_j$$

6 **end**

Optimization problem (3.28) involves the norm of a large but low-rank matrix, similar to (3.16). Hence, we follow the same strategy of applying Lemma 3.1 leading to (3.19). The resulting procedure is summarized in Algorithm 7, which combines Algorithms 4 and 5. A visualization of the procedure is provided in Figure 3.3. Recall that, in order to generate an n -term extrapolant, $\text{RRE}_{\Delta}^{\text{LR}}$ (Algorithm 1) requires $n + 1$ iterates while $\text{RRE}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{LR}}$ (Algorithm 5) requires n . Compare Figures 3.1 and 3.3 for the case $n = 2$, showing that $\text{RRE}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{LR}}$ is able to use more information of the iterates than $\text{RRE}_{\Delta}^{\text{LR}}$ when given the same number of iterates. Note that Algorithm 7 is presented in the way to contrast Algorithm 6 and emphasize the application of RRE therein, yet it could be easily extended to arbitrary functional \mathcal{F} , namely, by dropping the assumption that each residual $\mathcal{R}(X_i)$ has the same rank. Instead, all we need is to allow the residual factors R_i and associated inner factor T_i (which may no longer be the same for each iteration) to have a different size and partition the QR-decomposition in Line 2 accordingly.

Remark 3.1. *The residual factors R_1, \dots, R_n and the inner factor T required to formulate the optimization problem (3.28) are computed at each RADI step (Algorithm 6). Hence, these are available at no extra cost. The additional cost of computing the RRE extrapolant consists of computing a QR-decomposition of the concatenated residual factors (although the orthogonal matrix in this decomposition is not needed explicitly) and finding optimal coefficients (Algorithm 1).*

To monitor progress and provide a stopping criterion, the residual of the extrapolant, $\mathcal{R}(\hat{X})$, is needed. Since the extrapolant has a low-rank structure, $\hat{X} = \hat{Z} \hat{D} \hat{Z}^\top$, the corresponding residual $\mathcal{R}(\hat{X})$ directly reveals a similar low-rank structure; see formula (3.25). Lemma 3.1 may again be used to efficiently evaluate the Frobenius or spectral norm. Interestingly, as the following theorem will show, $\text{range}(\mathcal{R}(\hat{X})) \subseteq \text{range}(R_1) \cup \dots \cup \text{range}(R_n)$, for which the proof (see Appendix A) naturally provides an efficient approach to recursively obtain a factorization of $\mathcal{R}(\hat{X})$.

Theorem 3.1. *The residual of the n -term extrapolant \hat{X} from RRE remains in the range of $[R_1 \ R_2 \ \dots \ R_n]$ and there exists the factorization*

$$\mathcal{R}(\hat{X}) = [R_1 \ R_2 \ \dots \ R_n] \mathcal{H}_n [R_1 \ R_2 \ \dots \ R_n]^\top,$$




Figure 3.3: Schema illustrating the application of RRE to the first 3 low-rank iterates X_1, X_2, X_3 and corresponding residual factors R_1, R_2, R_3 (with $T = I$), where the weights τ_1, τ_2, τ_3 are as in (3.20).

of this residual, where R_n is the residual factor of $\mathcal{R}(X_n) = R_n T R_n^T$ and \mathcal{H}_n is a symmetric matrix of size $np \times np$ that satisfies

$$\mathcal{H}_n \equiv \mathcal{H}_n(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n) = \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1^2 T + (\gamma_2 - \gamma_2^2) \tilde{Y}_2 & (\gamma_2 - \gamma_2^2)(T - \tilde{Y}_2) \\ (\gamma_2 - \gamma_2^2)(T - \tilde{Y}_2) & \gamma_2^2 T + (\gamma_2 - \gamma_2^2) \tilde{Y}_2 \end{bmatrix}, & n = 2, \\ \mathcal{A}_n + \mathcal{B}_n + \mathcal{C}_n, & n \geq 3, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_n = \text{blkdiag}(\mathcal{H}_{n-1}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_{n-2}, \gamma_{n-1} + \gamma_n), \mathbf{0}_{p \times p}),$$

$$\mathcal{B}_n = \text{blkdiag}\left(\mathbf{0}_{(n-2)p \times (n-2)p}, \begin{bmatrix} (\gamma_n^2 - 2\gamma_n)T + (\gamma_n - \gamma_n^2)\tilde{Y}_n & (\gamma_n - \gamma_n^2)(T - \tilde{Y}_n) \\ (\gamma_n - \gamma_n^2)(T - \tilde{Y}_n) & \gamma_n^2 T + (\gamma_n - \gamma_n^2)\tilde{Y}_n \end{bmatrix}\right),$$

and

$$\mathcal{C}_n = \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_n + \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_n^T, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_n = \begin{bmatrix} (n-2)p & p & p \\ \mathbf{0} & M_n & -M_n \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}_{(n-1)p},$$

where

$$M_n = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_{n2}\alpha_{2n}C_{2n} \\ \beta_{n3}\alpha_{3n}C_{3n} - \beta_{n2}\alpha_{2n}C_{2n} \\ \beta_{n4}\alpha_{4n}C_{4n} - \beta_{n3}\alpha_{3n}C_{3n} \\ \vdots \\ \beta_{n,n-1}\alpha_{n-1,n}C_{n-1,n} - \beta_{n,n-2}\alpha_{n-2,n}C_{n-2,n} \\ -\beta_{n,n-1}\alpha_{n-1,n}C_{n-1,n} \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\alpha_{in} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\sigma_{i-1}\sigma_{n-1}}} \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \beta_{ni} = \gamma_n \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \gamma_j, \quad C_{in} = V_i^T B H^{-1} B^T V_n \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p},$$

and we use $\text{blkdiag}(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k)$ to denote the block diagonal matrix formed by aligning the block A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k along the main diagonal.

Remark 3.2. *The result of Theorem 3.1 provides an expression for the residual of the extrapolant in terms of the RRE weights γ_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$. Thus, one could in principle directly minimize the Frobenius or spectral norm of this residual (applying Lemma 3.1 to ensure computational feasibility). However, we note that Theorem 3.1 treats the specific case of the ARE, while the RRE extrapolation technique we propose in this work can be applied to any iterative process for which the residuals are available. Furthermore, finding the RRE weights (3.19) can be done even if the coefficients of the ARE are not directly available (making this method less intrusive).*

We now consider the application of the RRE extrapolant based on (3.14) in a cycling scheme (Algorithm 3). RADI is guaranteed to converge to the unique stabilizing solution of the ARE if i) the shift parameters satisfy the non-Blaschke condition (3.26); ii) it is initialized using a stabilizing initial guess Y with $\mathcal{R}(Y) \succeq 0$ (in case the spectrum of (A, E) is in the open left half plane, $Y = 0$ may be used); and, in case the spectrum of (A, E) is not in the open left half plane, iii) RADI is applied to the closed-loop ARE associated with Y [27]. Property (ii) is mentioned in [4, p. 308] but without an explanation. We will investigate the conditions on the RRE coefficients $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$, for which these constraints on Y and $\mathcal{R}(Y)$ are satisfied at the beginning of each cycle (i.e., after each extrapolation step). For notational compactness, we derive these conditions for $i = 1, \dots, n$ as in Section 2, and define $V_1 := Z_1$ as well as $\tilde{D}_1 := D_1$.

To investigate when $\hat{X} \succeq 0$, we note that each iterate X_i can be written as a sum of positive semi-definite products $V_j D_j V_j^T$:

$$X_i = \sum_{j=1}^i V_j D_j V_j^T. \quad (3.29)$$

Hence, a sufficient condition that $\hat{X} = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i X_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i V_i \tilde{D}_i V_i^T \succeq 0$, is $\tau_i \geq 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. This gives the following set of linear inequality constraints on γ_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, to ensure $\hat{X} \succeq 0$:

$$\sum_{i=j}^n \gamma_j \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (3.30)$$

For the condition $\mathcal{R}(\hat{X}) \succeq 0$, the next theorem gives a sufficient and necessary condition for the residual of the two-term extrapolant ($n = 2$) to be positive semi-definite. Its proof is given in Appendix B.

Theorem 3.2. *The residual of the two-term extrapolant*

$$\mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + \gamma_2 X_2) = \begin{bmatrix} R_1 & R_2 \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_2 \begin{bmatrix} R_1^T \\ R_2^T \end{bmatrix}$$

is positive semi-definite if and only if $0 \leq \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \leq 1$.

Although Theorem 3.2 only treats the case $n = 2$, we numerically observed (for an instance of the ARE using randomly generated coefficients) that a similar condition holds for $n = 3$. Namely, $\mathcal{R}(\hat{X}) \succeq 0$ if and only if $0 \leq \gamma_i \leq 1$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Based on these results, we formulate the following conjecture.

Conjecture 3.1. *The residual of the extrapolant*

$$\mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + \dots + \gamma_n X_n) = \begin{bmatrix} R_1 & \dots & R_n \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_n \begin{bmatrix} R_1^T \\ \vdots \\ R_n^T \end{bmatrix}$$

is positive semi-definite if and only if

$$0 \leq \gamma_i \leq 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (3.31)$$

The bounds (3.31) to ensure positive semi-definiteness of the residual are stronger than the bounds (3.30) to ensure positive semi-definiteness of the extrapolant. As a result, applying RRE to ARE in a restarting scheme leads to a search space for the coefficients that is more limited

than for a non-restarting scheme (in which case (3.31) is not required). Hence, the residual of the extrapolant may also be larger than without the limitation (3.31), leading to an increased number of iterations and computational time required until convergence. This matter will be numerically investigated in Section 4.

The bounds on the RRE coefficients (3.30) and (3.31) are required because the solution of an ARE is in general non-unique and one is typically only interested in the maximum (in the Loewner ordering) positive semi-definite (PSD) solution. These bounds prevent the extrapolated sequence from converging to a non-PSD solution. In the special case of Lyapunov equations (when $B = 0$), the solution is unique and, hence, these bounds are not required. Furthermore, the bounds (3.31) ensuring the residual remains PSD are not required when using a non-restarting scheme.

Remark 3.3. *Although the proposed bounds prevent the extrapolated sequence from converging to a non-PSD solution, we cannot guarantee convergence to the desired PSD solution. Finding convergence guarantees for RRE applied on nonlinear systems is difficult and usually requires the introduction of heuristic assumptions, see [43] for more details and some results.*

4. Numerical examples

In this section, we evaluate the proposed method on several numerical examples of large-scale matrix equations with sparse coefficients. More specifically, each example is associated with a first-order state-space model of the form

$$\begin{aligned} E\dot{z}(t) &= Az(t) + Bu(t), \\ y(t) &= Cz(t), \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where $z(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the state, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the input and $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^q$ is the output (in Section 4.4, we consider a second-order system which we represent in the above first-order form). We focus on examples in which the state dimension is large compared to the dimension of the input and output. The operators E, A, B and C are matrices, where $E, A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ are sparse, E is regular and the spectrum of (A, E) is in the open left half plane.

Associated with each model (4.1) is the ARE (3.24) using the coefficients of the state-space model (4.1) as the coefficients of the equation and $H = I_p$ unless otherwise specified.

We use the RADI method to produce iterates X_1, X_2, \dots for the Riccati equation. We stopped the iterative process once the relative 2-norm of the residual reached the threshold 10^{-10} . Unless otherwise indicated, the extrapolation is performed with $n = 3$, where n denotes the number of iterates used in the extrapolation.

All numerical experiments were performed on 8 cores of an AMD EPYC 7763 and required about 100 GiB of Random Access Memory (RAM). In terms of software we used MATLAB R2020b on Linux and RADI based on version 3.0 of the MATLAB version of the M.E.S.S. toolbox [37]. We also use RADI when iteratively solving the Lyapunov equations in Sections 4.1 and 4.3 (in which case the RADI method coincides with the ADI method). To generate the shift parameters, projection shifts [6] are used. We used the function `mess_res2_norms` to compute and plot the residuals associated with each of the following modes:

1. RADI: The RADI iterates. Indicated in plots by a solid green disk if initialized from zero and by a green circle if initialized from a cycle restart.
2. RADI+RRE (non-cycling): The RADI iterates accelerated by non-cycling RRE (Algorithm 2).
3. RADI+RRE (cycling): The RADI iterates accelerated by cycling RRE (Algorithm 3). After a cycle restart, the residuals are re-assembled akin to formula (3.25).

In our implementation, the main computational cost of RRE is the QR-decomposition of the residual factors (Line 2 in Algorithm 7). We use the MATLAB function `qr` to accomplish this. However, the Q-term of the QR-decomposition is not needed, which may be exploited to reduce the computational cost [8]. Furthermore, we compute the RRE extrapolant in each iteration (provided at least n iterates are available). Computing the extrapolant only when significant speed-up is expected could substantially lower the computational overhead. We intend to investigate such

optimizations of the implementation later, and focus here on the acceleration in terms of the number of iterations only.

4.1. Example 1: Toeplitz system matrix

4.1.1. Nonlinear

This is a synthetic example based on the modifications of [26, Example 1] introduced in [5, Example 4.4]. It is given by the following matrices:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 2.8 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots \\ -1 & 2.8 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & \ddots \\ 0 & -1 & 2.8 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \ddots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & & & 0 & -1 & 2.8 \end{bmatrix}, \quad E = I, \quad (4.2)$$

with $d = 100\,000$. The entries of the matrices B and C are drawn independently from a normal distribution (together with the MATLAB command `rng(1)` to ensure reproducibility of the results). B is scaled such that $\|B\| = 1$. We take $p = 5$ and try several values of q (1, 20 and 40) to investigate the influence of this parameter on the results. (Recall that p and q are the dimensions of the input and output.) We set $H = 10^{-4} \cdot I_p$.

The results are shown in Figure 4.1. Note first the staircase pattern present in all plots, in which a decrease in residual is sometimes followed by several iterations in which the residual stays almost constant. For $q = 1$, i.e., the C matrix has a single row, the improvement in residual from the extrapolation is modest for the first 20 iterations after which it is significantly improved. As a result, the convergence criterion (the horizontal line in the figures) is reached already after 30 iterations instead of 44 iterations for the non-accelerated sequence. In cycling mode, the 2 restarts in iterations 20 and 28 further reduce the residual, although the convergence criterion is still only reached after 30 iterations (the same as for the non-cycling mode).

When we increase q , it can be observed from Figures 4.1b and 4.1c that the number of iterations required by RADI increases to more than 60. In non-cycling mode, for $q = 20$ RRE reduces the number of iterations from 64 to just 63, and for $q = 40$ it decreases the number of iterations from 76 to 64.

Remark 4.1. *In cycling mode, we observe that the iterates generated by RADI initialized from the new cycle have a non-PSD residual. We suspect that this causes the stagnation of both the RADI iterates and the RRE extrapolates from iteration 55.*

Furthermore, as we did not implement condition (3.31), we observed the residual to be indefinite on every cycle restart in all of Section 4. It remains inconclusive whether this violation of property (ii), see page 16, has an impact on the convergence of RADI.

During the first iterations, when the relative residual is close to 1, the residual after RRE is for many iterations larger than the residual of RADI. This is because the ARE is a nonlinear equation and, hence, optimization (3.5) only approximately minimizes the residual of the extrapolant; see Section 2 but with $\widetilde{\text{res}}(\cdot) \neq \text{res}(\cdot)$. The approximation becomes more accurate for smaller residuals, which is reflected by the fact that the RRE residual is much smaller than the RADI residual for those iterations.

4.1.2. Linear

The previous results illustrate the ineffectiveness of the cycling strategy for the nonlinear ARE (see Remark 4.1). In this section, therefore, we study a linear equation, for which RADI coincides with the ADI method. Namely, the Lyapunov equation obtained by setting $B = 0$. Because the spectrum of (A, E) is in the open left half plane, the solution is unique (in contrast to the nonlinear ARE). This property may result in improved effectiveness of the cycling strategy.

The results are shown in Figure 4.2. For $q = 1$, the effect of RRE is negligible, indicating optimality of the ADI iterates. For $q = 20$ and $q = 40$, on the other hand, both non-cycling and




Figure 4.1: Results of the nonlinear Toeplitz example with varying numbers of outputs q . Cycling restarts are marked by a small vertical bar. Underlying iterations after a restart are marked by hollow circles.




Figure 4.2: Results of the linear Toeplitz example with varying numbers of outputs q . Cycling restarts are marked by a small vertical bar. Underlying iterations after a restart are marked by hollow circles.

cycling RRE reduce the number of iterations required to reach the convergence threshold. In this linear setting, no stagnation of the cycling strategy is observed.

4.2. Example 2: chip

This example concerns a model of the convective flow in a microelectronic chip structure [29]. The 3D structure is semi-discretized using finite element method (FEM) with $d = 20082$ states representing temperature. The $q = 5$ outputs of the model correspond to temperatures at 5 points in the geometry. The single input ($p = 1$) represents the power dissipated by a heat element in the structure. The matrices have been downloaded from the MOR Wiki website [48]. Due to the convection present in the problem, $A \neq A^T$, and the E matrix is symmetric and has full rank. In the experiments, we test several variations of the ARE (3.24) where we scale the quadratic term therein, i.e.:

$$H = \lambda I_p. \quad (4.3)$$

Increasing λ makes the corresponding ARE closer to a Lyapunov equation, while decreasing λ enhances the nonlinearity of the equation. The results for several values of λ are displayed in Figure 4.3.

We can observe that the benefit of RRE is greater for smaller λ . Thus, as the quadratic term becomes less significant, the iterates generated by RADI become closer to optimal (in the sense of optimization problem (3.5)). For $\lambda = 10^{-4}$ (Figure 4.3c), the acceleration is greatest. In iteration 41, the RRE residual is more than 3 orders of magnitude better than the RADI residual. Hence, we also start a new cycle at that iteration. From that iteration onwards, the cycling scheme exhibits a lower residual than the non-cycling scheme, illustrating the potential benefit of the




Figure 4.3: Results of the chip example with varying $H = \lambda I_p$. Cycling restarts are marked by a small vertical bar. Underlying iterations after a restart are marked by hollow circles.

former. However, the convergence threshold of 10^{-10} is not reached; similar to the Toeplitz system matrix example in Figure 4.1b (Remark 4.1).

4.3. Example 3: steel rail profile

This example concerns the heat transfer in a steel rail profile [30]. It considers a 2D structural cross-section of the rail semi-discretized using FEM with $d = 317377$. There are $p = 7$ inputs which parameterize the temperature on the boundary of the steel rail. In the control problem associated with this benchmark, these inputs represent the temperature of the cooling fluid used to control the internal temperature of the steel rail. Related to these inputs, the $q = 6$ outputs are chosen in line with the control objective of minimizing temperature differences at specific points in the geometry. See [9] for more details.

For this example, we consider the Riccati equation with $H = 10^{-4} \cdot I_p$ and, in addition, two Lyapunov equations (which are linear special cases of the Riccati equation). First, the Lyapunov equation associated with the controllability Gramian $P \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$:

$$APE^T + EPA^T + BB^T = 0. \quad (4.4)$$

Second, the Lyapunov equation associated with the observability Gramian $E^TQE \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$:

$$A^TQE + E^TQA + C^TC = 0. \quad (4.5)$$

The results for the Riccati equation and two Lyapunov equations are shown in Figure 4.4. Since in this example A and E are symmetric (with $E \neq I$ positive definite), the shift parameters are real-valued. For the Lyapunov equations, the RRE acceleration does not significantly reduce




Figure 4.4: Results of the steel rail profile example. Cycling restarts are marked by a small vertical bar. Underlying iterations after a restart are marked by hollow circles.

the residual, indicating that the iterates generated by ADI are already nearly optimal (in the sense of optimization problem (3.5)). For the Riccati equation, on the other hand, the RRE acceleration significantly reduces the residual compared to the non-accelerated RADI in iterations where stagnation occurs. In this way, the number of iterations required to reach the convergence criterion (the dashed horizontal line in Figure 4.4c) is reduced from 107 to 93. In cycling mode, the restart in iteration 66 for the ARE again leads to stagnation; see Remark 4.1.

4.4. Example 4: triple chain

In this section, we consider an example of a mechanical system. The example is based on [49, Example 2] and consists of a configuration of interconnected masses, springs, and dampers. In second-order formulation, the model is given by

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\text{mass}}\ddot{x} + C_{\text{damp}}\dot{x} + K_{\text{stiff}}x &= B_u u, \\ y &= C_y x. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

We use 30 001 masses, giving $d = 60\,002$ ($p = q = 1$) in the following first-order formulation (4.1):

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \begin{bmatrix} -K_{\text{stiff}} & 0 \\ 0 & M_{\text{mass}} \end{bmatrix}, & A &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -K_{\text{stiff}} \\ -K_{\text{stiff}} & -C_{\text{damp}} \end{bmatrix}, \\ C &= [C_y \ 0], & B &= [0 \ B_u^T]^T. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we apply a perfect shuffle permutation such that A and E have almost banded structure [23], which we observed to be able to significantly improve numerical conditioning. The Rayleigh damping factors α and β which relate the damping matrix C_{damp} to the mass matrix M_{mass} and the




Figure 4.5: Results of the triple chain example with varying RRE window size n . Cycling restarts are marked by a small vertical bar. Underlying iterations after a restart are marked by hollow circles.

stiffness matrix K_{stiff} as in

$$C_{\text{damp}} = \alpha M_{\text{mass}} + \beta K_{\text{stiff}} \quad (4.7)$$

are both set to 0.1. The viscosity of the dampers is set to $\nu = 5$ and for the masses and stiffness coefficients we use the following values (see [49, Figure 5.1]):

$$\begin{aligned} m_0 = 10, \quad m_1 = 1, \quad m_2 = 2, \quad m_3 = 3, \\ k_0 = 50, \quad k_1 = 10, \quad k_2 = 20, \quad k_3 = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

For this example, we evaluate the method using the ARE (3.24) and several settings for the window size n . The results are displayed in Figure 4.5. The residual of the extrapolants is (significantly) higher than the residual of the RADI iterates for all window sizes n for the first 30 iterations. After these initial 30 iterations, in the non-cycling mode, we would expect the RRE residual to decrease faster for larger n , while for $n = 6$ and $n = 12$ the RRE residual sometimes even exceed the RADI residuals up to iteration 50. All these observations are likely caused by the nonlinearity of the ARE (3.24). Starting at iteration 56, during the last stagnation phase before the termination of RADI, the picture changes: the wider $n = 12$ yields a small but consistent acceleration, while the RRE residuals of the narrower n collapse onto the RADI residuals. This may, however, be caused by the (default) optimizer of MATLAB we used and its associated numerical tolerances. Enabling cycling mode in this example again leads to stagnation of the residual; see Remark 4.1. Possibly, restarting before the iterate is sufficiently close to the solution exacerbates the numerical ill-conditioning of the subsequent RADI iterates.

4.5. Error of RRE solution on small versions of the examples

A Riccati equation can have many solutions, while typically one is only interested in the unique stabilizing solution. Under some technical assumptions, as discussed in Section 3.3, RADI is guaranteed to converge to this stabilizing solution. As mentioned in Remark 3.3, no such guarantees exist for the RRE solution.

Hence, we confirm that the RRE solution is close to the desired PSD solution on small-scale versions of all numerical examples presented in this section (except the chip example presented in Section 4.2). We compute the relative error of the RRE solution \hat{X} with respect to the exact solution X (computed using the MATLAB function `icare`) given by $\|X\|^{-1} \cdot \|X - \hat{X}\|$. The results are as follows:

- Section 4.1 (Toeplitz system matrix): size $d = 500$ and relative error $5 \cdot 10^{-14}$.
- Section 4.3 (steel rail profile): size $d = 371$ and relative error $7 \cdot 10^{-13}$.
- Section 4.4 (triple chain): size $d = 302$ and relative error $4 \cdot 10^{-9}$.

5. Conclusion and outlook

We proposed an extension of RRE that allows it to be applied to nonstationary fixed-point iterations and problems involving large-scale low-rank matrices. We formulated an efficient least-squares problem to find the RRE extrapolant. Although our scheme can be applied to arbitrary sequences of low-rank matrices, we specifically discussed its application to accelerating iterative solvers of large-scale matrix equations (in particular the ARE). We analyzed some theoretical properties of the extrapolation applied to the RADI algorithm and showed that linear equality constraints on the RRE coefficients are sufficient to prevent convergence to non-PSD solutions for a non-restarting RRE scheme. However, we also conjecture that for a restarting RRE scheme additional constraints are required which diminish the acceleration potential for AREs. The numerical examples that we treated illustrated the potential of the approach. We specifically investigated how the convergence acceleration may be affected by the problem size, the type of equation and the number of iterates used for extrapolation.



In the future, we intend to derive convergence guarantees for our RRE method applied to AREs. As mentioned in Remark 3.3, convergence of RRE for general nonlinear systems is a difficult task if we only have knowledge of some regularity properties of the nonlinearity. For the specific case of AREs, we have an explicit form of the nonlinearity (formula (3.27) and Algorithm 6) which may allow us to obtain convergence results that, in contrast to existing results in literature, do not require heuristic assumptions that are hard to verify. Furthermore, an investigation of the benefits of RRE in terms of computational time will be interesting, and requires development of a strategy that adaptively enables RRE.

Code and data availability

The algorithms implemented in this paper and the data sets analyzed are available at:

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14103909>

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by ECSEL Joint Undertaking under grant agreement number 101007319 (AI-TWILIGHT). We thank Eda Oktay  and Fan Wang  for their review of our codes and independent verification of the reproducibility of the numerical experiments.

A. Proof of Theorem 3.1

Proof. Before starting the proof we need the following auxiliary identities, which can be shown, after some manipulation, from the modified RADI iteration (Algorithm 6), that is,

$$A^\top V_k \tilde{Y}_k^{-1} V_k^\top E = R_{k-1} T (R_k^\top - R_{k-1}^\top) + E^\top X_{k-1} B H^{-1} B^\top V_k \tilde{Y}_k^{-1} V_k^\top E - \sigma_{k-1} E^\top V_k \tilde{Y}_k^{-1} V_k^\top E \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} -\gamma_k^2 E^\top V_k \tilde{Y}_k^{-1} V_k^\top B H^{-1} B^\top V_k \tilde{Y}_k^{-1} V_k^\top E &= -\gamma_k^2 E^\top V_k \tilde{Y}_k^{-1} \cdot 2\sigma_{k-1} (T - \tilde{Y}_k) \cdot \tilde{Y}_k^{-1} V_k^\top E \\ &= \gamma_k^2 (R_k - R_{k-1}) T (R_k^\top - R_{k-1}^\top) + 2\gamma_k^2 \sigma_{k-1} E^\top V_k \tilde{Y}_k^{-1} V_k^\top E, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where

$$2\sigma_k E^\top V_k \tilde{Y}_k^{-1} V_k^\top E = -(R_k - R_{k-1}) \tilde{Y}_k (R_k^\top - R_{k-1}^\top). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

The proof is by induction on the number n of extrapolation terms. First consider the case $n = 2$. From the assumption $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 = 1$ and the equation (with $V_1 \equiv Z_1$ and $\tilde{Y}_1^{-1} \equiv D_1$)

$$X_k = \sum_{i=1}^k V_i \tilde{Y}_i^{-1} V_i^\top, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

we have $\mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + \gamma_2 X_2) = \mathcal{R}(X_1 + \gamma_2 V_2 \tilde{Y}_2^{-1} V_2^\top)$. Using (3.24), the expression then can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + \gamma_2 X_2) &= \mathcal{R}(X_1) + \gamma_2 (A^\top V_2 \tilde{Y}_2^{-1} V_2^\top E + \square^\top) \\ &\quad - (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) \gamma_2 (E^H X_1 B H^{-1} B^\top V_2 \tilde{Y}_2^{-1} V_2^\top + \square^\top) - \gamma_2^2 E^H V_2 \tilde{Y}_2^{-1} V_2^\top B H^{-1} B^\top V_2 \tilde{Y}_2^{-1} V_2^\top E, \end{aligned}$$

where and henceforth we write the “ \square^\top ” symbol rightmost inside a bracket as a shorthand for the transpose of the preceding terms (for the sake of brevity). It follows from (A.1) and (A.2) and then (A.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + \gamma_2 X_2) &= \mathcal{R}(X_1) + \gamma_2 (R_1 T (R_2^\top - R_1^\top) + \square^\top) - 2\gamma_2 \sigma_1 E^\top V_2 \tilde{Y}_2^{-1} V_2^\top E \\ &\quad + ((\gamma_2 - (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)\gamma_2) E^\top X_1 B H^{-1} B^\top V_2 \tilde{Y}_2^{-1} V_2^\top E + \square^\top) \\ &\quad + \gamma_2^2 (R_2 - R_1) T (R_2^\top - R_1^\top) + 2\gamma_2^2 \sigma_1 E^\top V_2 \tilde{Y}_2^{-1} V_2^\top E \\ &= \mathcal{R}(X_1) + \gamma_2 (R_1 T (R_2^\top - R_1^\top) + \square^\top) + \gamma_2^2 (R_2 - R_1) T (R_2^\top - R_1^\top) \\ &\quad + 2(\gamma_2^2 - \gamma_2) \sigma_1 E^\top V_2 \tilde{Y}_2^{-1} V_2^\top E \\ &= \mathcal{R}(X_1) + \gamma_2 (R_1 T (R_2^\top - R_1^\top) + \square^\top) + \gamma_2^2 (R_2 - R_1) T (R_2^\top - R_1^\top) \\ &\quad + (\gamma_2 - \gamma_2^2) (R_2 - R_1) \tilde{Y}_2 (R_2^\top - R_1^\top). \end{aligned}$$

The final expression can equivalently be written as the factorization

$$\mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + \gamma_2 X_2) = [R_1 \quad R_2] \mathcal{H}_2 \begin{bmatrix} R_1^\top \\ R_2^\top \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{H}_2 \equiv \mathcal{H}_2(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \mathcal{A}_2 + \mathcal{B}_2,$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_2 = \text{blkdiag}(T, \mathbf{0}_{p \times p}), \quad \mathcal{B}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} (\gamma_2^2 - 2\gamma_2)T + (\gamma_2 - \gamma_2^2)\tilde{Y}_2 & (\gamma_2 - \gamma_2^2)(T - \tilde{Y}_2) \\ (\gamma_2 - \gamma_2^2)(T - \tilde{Y}_2) & \gamma_2^2 T + (\gamma_2 - \gamma_2^2)\tilde{Y}_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This clearly shows $\text{range}(\mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + \gamma_2 X_2)) \subseteq \text{range}([R_1 \ R_2])$. Although in the expression for \mathcal{H}_2 there is only one free parameter γ_2 as a result of the constraint $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 = 1$, here we still write out explicitly the dependence on all the parameters as $\mathcal{H}_2(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$; same for all the \mathcal{H}_k below.

We will see later that the case $n = 2$ is special in that the terms $E^\top X_1 B H^{-1} B^\top V_2 \tilde{Y}_2^{-1} V_2^\top E$ and its transpose disappear because their coefficients cancel out as $\gamma_2 - (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)\gamma_2 = 0$, which is a property that does not hold for arbitrary $n \neq 2$.

In order to see the pattern, we also present the case of $n = 3$ in detail (as the *base case* for induction). We have, using the assumption $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3 = 1$ and (A.1)–(A.4),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + \gamma_2 X_2 + \gamma_3 X_3) = \mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + (\gamma_2 + \gamma_3)X_2 + \gamma_3 V_3 \tilde{Y}_3^{-1} V_3^\top) \\
& = \mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + (\gamma_2 + \gamma_3)X_2) + \gamma_3 (A^\top V_3 \tilde{Y}_3^{-1} V_3^\top E + \square^\top) \\
& \quad - \gamma_3^2 E^\top V_3 \tilde{Y}_3^{-1} V_3^\top B H^{-1} B^\top V_3 \tilde{Y}_3^{-1} V_3^\top E \\
& \quad - \gamma_3 (E^\top (\gamma_1 X_1 + (\gamma_2 + \gamma_3)X_2) B H^{-1} B^\top V_3 \tilde{Y}_3^{-1} V_3^\top E + \square^\top) \\
& = \mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + (\gamma_2 + \gamma_3)X_2) + \gamma_3 (R_2 T (R_3^\top - R_2^\top) + \square^\top) - 2\gamma_3 \sigma_2 E^\top V_3 \tilde{Y}_3^{-1} V_3^\top E \\
& \quad + \gamma_3 (E^\top ((1 - \gamma_2 - \gamma_3)X_2 - \gamma_1 X_1) B H^{-1} B^\top V_3 \tilde{Y}_3^{-1} V_3^\top E + \square^\top) \\
& \quad + \gamma_3^2 (R_3 - R_2) T (R_3^\top - R_2^\top) + 2\gamma_3^2 \sigma_2 E^\top V_3 \tilde{Y}_3^{-1} V_3^\top E \\
& = \mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + (\gamma_2 + \gamma_3)X_2) + \gamma_3 (R_2 T (R_3^\top - R_2^\top) + \square^\top) + \gamma_3^2 (R_3 - R_2) T (R_3^\top - R_2^\top) \\
& \quad + (\gamma_3 - \gamma_3^2) (R_3 - R_2) \tilde{Y}_3 (R_3^\top - R_2^\top) \\
& \quad + \gamma_3 (E^\top \gamma_1 (X_2 - X_1) B H^{-1} B^\top V_3 \tilde{Y}_3^{-1} V_3^\top E + \square^\top),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\text{range}(\mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + (\gamma_2 + \gamma_3)X_2)) \subseteq \text{range}([R_1 \ R_2])$ from the case of $n = 2$, and so we only need to investigate the last two terms:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (E^\top (X_2 - X_1) B H^{-1} B^\top V_3 \tilde{Y}_3^{-1} V_3^\top E + \square^\top) \\
& = E^\top V_2 \tilde{Y}_2^{-1} V_2^\top B H^{-1} B^\top V_3 \tilde{Y}_3^{-1} V_3^\top E + E^\top V_3 \tilde{Y}_3^{-1} V_3^\top B H^{-1} B^\top V_2 \tilde{Y}_2^{-1} V_2^\top E.
\end{aligned}$$

Defining

$$\alpha_{ik} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\sigma_{i-1}\sigma_{k-1}}} \in \mathbb{R}, \quad C_{ik} = V_i^\top B H^{-1} B^\top V_k \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& (E^\top (X_2 - X_1) B H^{-1} B^\top V_3 \tilde{Y}_3^{-1} V_3^\top E + \square^\top) = \\
& \quad \alpha_{23} ((R_2 - R_1) C_{23} (R_3^\top - R_2^\top) + (R_3 - R_2) C_{23}^\top (R_2^\top - R_1^\top)),
\end{aligned}$$

and, therefore,

$$\gamma_3 (\gamma_1 E^\top (X_2 - X_1) B H^{-1} B^\top V_3 \tilde{Y}_3^{-1} V_3^\top E + \square^\top) = [R_1 \ R_2 \ R_3] \mathcal{C}_3 [R_1 \ R_2 \ R_3]^\top,$$

where

$$\mathcal{C}_3 = \gamma_3 \gamma_1 \alpha_{23} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & C_{23} & -C_{23} \\ C_{23}^\top & -C_{23} - C_{23}^\top & C_{23} \\ -C_{23}^\top & C_{23} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, the factorization follows:

$$\mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + \gamma_2 X_2 + \gamma_3 X_3) = [R_1 \ R_2 \ R_3] \mathcal{H}_3 \begin{bmatrix} R_1^\top \\ R_2^\top \\ R_3^\top \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}_3 \equiv \mathcal{H}_3(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3) = \mathcal{A}_3 + \mathcal{B}_3 + \mathcal{C}_3,$$

with

$$\mathcal{A}_3 = \text{blkdiag}(\mathcal{H}_2(\gamma_1, \gamma_2 + \gamma_3), \mathbf{0}_{p \times p})$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}_3 = \text{blkdiag} \left(\mathbf{0}_{p \times p}, \begin{bmatrix} (\gamma_3^2 - 2\gamma_3)T + (\gamma_3 - \gamma_3^2)\tilde{Y}_3 & (\gamma_3 - \gamma_3^2)(T - \tilde{Y}_3) \\ (\gamma_3 - \gamma_3^2)(T - \tilde{Y}_3) & \gamma_3^2 T + (\gamma_3 - \gamma_3^2)\tilde{Y}_3 \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

This clearly shows $\text{range}(\mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + \gamma_2 X_2 + \gamma_3 X_3)) \subseteq \text{range}([R_1 \ R_2 \ R_3])$.

and

$$M_k = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_{k2}\alpha_{2k}C_{2k} \\ \beta_{k3}\alpha_{3k}C_{3k} - \beta_{k2}\alpha_{2k}C_{2k} \\ \beta_{k4}\alpha_{4k}C_{4k} - \beta_{k3}\alpha_{3k}C_{3k} \\ \vdots \\ \beta_{k,k-1}\alpha_{k-1,k}C_{k-1,k} - \beta_{k,k-2}\alpha_{k-2,k}C_{k-2,k} \\ -\beta_{k,k-1}\alpha_{k-1,k}C_{k-1,k} \end{bmatrix}, \quad k \geq 3.$$

Then, the factorization follows:

$$\mathcal{R} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i X_i \right) = [R_1 \ R_2 \ \cdots \ R_k] \mathcal{H}_k \begin{bmatrix} R_1^\top \\ R_2^\top \\ \vdots \\ R_k^\top \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{H}_k \equiv \mathcal{H}_k(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_k) = \mathcal{A}_k + \mathcal{B}_k + \mathcal{C}_k,$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_k = \text{blkdiag}(\mathcal{H}_{k-1}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_{k-2}, \gamma_{k-1} + \gamma_k), \mathbf{0}_{p \times p}).$$

in which the existence of $\mathcal{H}_{k-1}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_{k-2}, \gamma_{k-1} + \gamma_k) \equiv \mathcal{H}_{k-1}$ such that

$$\mathcal{R} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k-2} \gamma_j X_j + (\gamma_{k-1} + \gamma_k) X_{k-1} \right) = [R_1 \ R_2 \ \cdots \ R_{k-1}] \mathcal{H}_{k-1} \begin{bmatrix} R_1^\top \\ R_2^\top \\ \vdots \\ R_{k-1}^\top \end{bmatrix}$$

follows from the inductive hypothesis, and

$$\mathcal{B}_k = \text{blkdiag} \left(\mathbf{0}_{(k-2)p \times (k-2)p}, \begin{bmatrix} (\gamma_k^2 - 2\gamma_k)T + (\gamma_k - \gamma_k^2)\tilde{Y}_k & (\gamma_k - \gamma_k^2)(T - \tilde{Y}_k) \\ (\gamma_k - \gamma_k^2)(T - \tilde{Y}_k) & \gamma_k^2 T + (\gamma_k - \gamma_k^2)\tilde{Y}_k \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

The range property $\text{range}(\mathcal{R}(\sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i X_i)) \subseteq \text{range}([R_1 \ R_2 \ \cdots \ R_k])$ follows (for $n = k$) and hence the induction is completed. \square

B. Proof of Theorem 3.2

Proof. Clearly, if we can factorize \mathcal{H}_2 into the form of HH^\top for some H , then a factorization of the same form is immediately available for $\mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + \gamma_2 X_2)$, which is equivalent to say the matrix is positive semi-definite.

Since T and \tilde{Y}_2 are both positive semi-definite, we can write $T = F_1 F_1^\top$ and $\tilde{Y}_2 = F_2 F_2^\top$, and then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_2 &= \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1^2 F_1 F_1^\top + \gamma_1 \gamma_2 F_2 F_2^\top & \gamma_1 \gamma_2 (F_1 F_1^\top - F_2 F_2^\top) \\ \gamma_1 \gamma_2 (F_1 F_1^\top - F_2 F_2^\top) & \gamma_2^2 F_1 F_1^\top + \gamma_1 \gamma_2 F_2 F_2^\top \end{bmatrix} \\ &=: \begin{bmatrix} \alpha F_1 & \gamma F_2 \\ \beta F_1 & \eta F_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\alpha} F_1^\top & \bar{\beta} F_1^\top \\ \bar{\gamma} F_2^\top & \bar{\eta} F_2^\top \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second identity holds if

$$\alpha \bar{\alpha} = \gamma_1^2, \quad \gamma \bar{\gamma} = \gamma_1 \gamma_2 = \bar{\eta} \eta, \quad \beta \bar{\beta} = \gamma_2^2$$

and

$$\alpha \bar{\beta} = \gamma_1 \gamma_2 = -\gamma \bar{\eta}, \quad \bar{\alpha} \beta = \gamma_1 \gamma_2 = -\eta \bar{\gamma}.$$

Since γ_1 and γ_2 are real numbers, it holds that $\overline{\gamma_1 \gamma_2} = \gamma_1 \gamma_2$ and therefore the set of conditions on the scalar coefficients $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \eta$ in the complex domain can be simplified as

$$|\alpha| = |\gamma_1|, \quad |\gamma|^2 = \gamma_1 \gamma_2, \quad |\eta|^2 = \gamma_1 \gamma_2, \quad |\beta| = |\gamma_2|$$

and

$$\alpha \bar{\beta} = \gamma_1 \gamma_2 = -\gamma \bar{\eta}.$$

A solution $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \eta\}$ to this set of equations obviously exists if $\gamma_1\gamma_2 \geq 0$: we can simply take

$$\alpha = \pm\gamma_1, \quad \beta = \pm\gamma_2$$

and

$$\gamma = \pm\sqrt{\gamma_1\gamma_2}, \quad \eta = \mp\sqrt{\gamma_1\gamma_2}$$

to obtain four different sets of real solutions. In other words, since $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 = 1$, we have shown that if $0 \leq \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \leq 1$, then the intermediate factor \mathcal{H}_2 is positive semi-definite and hence the residual of the extrapolant $\mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + \gamma_2 X_2)$ is positive semi-definite.

Next, we show by contradiction the condition $0 \leq \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \leq 1$ on the other hand is a necessary condition for the residual of the extrapolant to be positive semi-definite. Now suppose $\mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + \gamma_2 X_2)$ is positive semi-definite, so the intermediate factor \mathcal{H}_2 must be positive semi-definite. Suppose, however, the condition $0 \leq \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \leq 1$ is not satisfied, then from the relation $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 = 1$ it holds that $\gamma_1\gamma_2 < 0$, that is, $\gamma_1 < 0, \gamma_2 > 1$ with $|\gamma_2| > |\gamma_1|$ or $\gamma_2 < 0, \gamma_1 > 1$ with $|\gamma_1| > |\gamma_2|$. This is to say, we have $\gamma_1\gamma_2 < 0$ with either $|\gamma_1\gamma_2| > \gamma_1^2$ or $|\gamma_1\gamma_2| > \gamma_2^2$.

As a consequence of positive semi-definiteness of \mathcal{H}_2 , its $(1, 1)$ -block (one of the leading principal submatrix) $\gamma_1^2 F_1 F_1^\top + \gamma_1\gamma_2 F_2 F_2^\top \equiv \gamma_1^2 T + \gamma_1\gamma_2 \tilde{Y}_2$ is positive semi-definite and also $\gamma_2^2 F_1 F_1^\top + \gamma_1\gamma_2 F_2 F_2^\top \equiv \gamma_2^2 T + \gamma_1\gamma_2 \tilde{Y}_2$ is positive semi-definite (just consider the positive semi-definiteness of the Schur complement). Without loss of generality, suppose, from the above discussion, $\gamma_1\gamma_2 < 0$ holds with $|\gamma_1\gamma_2| > \gamma_1^2$. Then, we have

$$\gamma_1^2 T + \gamma_1\gamma_2 \tilde{Y}_2 + \gamma_1^2 \tilde{Y}_2 - \gamma_1^2 \tilde{Y}_2 \succcurlyeq 0 \iff \gamma_1^2 (T - \tilde{Y}_2) \succcurlyeq (|\gamma_1\gamma_2| - \gamma_1^2) \tilde{Y}_2,$$

where the latter Loewner order relation implies that $\gamma_1^2 (T - \tilde{Y}_2)$ is positive semi-definite because $(|\gamma_1\gamma_2| - \gamma_1^2) \tilde{Y}_2$ is positive semi-definite. On the other hand, recall from the modified RADI iteration (Algorithm 6) that, with $\sigma_k < 0$, we have $\tilde{Y}_2 \succcurlyeq T$, which is equivalent to say $T - \tilde{Y}_2$ is negative semi-definite; a contradiction!

Therefore, we have proved above that $0 \leq \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \leq 1$ is a sufficient and necessary condition for the residual of the extrapolant $\mathcal{R}(\gamma_1 X_1 + \gamma_2 X_2)$ to be positive semi-definite. \square

References

- [1] Alexander C. Aitken. On Bernoulli's numerical solution of algebraic equations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, 46:289–305, 1927. doi:10.1017/S0370164600022070.
- [2] Owe Axelsson. Conjugate gradient type methods for unsymmetric and inconsistent systems of linear equations. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 29:1–16, 1980. doi:10.1016/0024-3795(80)90226-8.
- [3] Peter Benner and Zvonimir Bujanović. On the solution of large-scale algebraic Riccati equations by using low-dimensional invariant subspaces. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 488:430–459, 2016. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2015.09.027.
- [4] Peter Benner, Zvonimir Bujanović, Patrick Kürschner, and Jens Saak. RADI: a low-rank ADI-type algorithm for large scale algebraic Riccati equations. *Numer. Math.*, 138:301–330, 2018. doi:10.1007/s00211-017-0907-5.
- [5] Peter Benner, Zvonimir Bujanović, Patrick Kürschner, and Jens Saak. A numerical comparison of different solvers for large-scale, continuous-time algebraic Riccati equations and LQR problems. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 42(2):A957–A996, 2020. doi:10.1137/18M1220960.
- [6] Peter Benner, Patrick Kürschner, and Jens Saak. Self-generating and efficient shift parameters in ADI methods for large Lyapunov and Sylvester equations. *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.*, 43:142–162, 2014. URL: <http://etna.mcs.kent.edu/volumes/2011-2020/vol43/abstract.php?vol=43&pages=142-162>.
- [7] Peter Benner, Patrick Kürschner, and Jens Saak. An improved numerical method for balanced truncation for symmetric second-order systems. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling of Dynamical Systems*, 19(6):593–615, 2013. doi:10.1080/13873954.2013.794363.

-
- [8] Peter Benner, Jing-Rebecca Li, and Thilo Penzl. Numerical solution of large-scale Lyapunov equations, Riccati equations, and linear-quadratic optimal control problems. *Numerical Linear Algebra with Applications*, 15(9):755–777, 2008. doi:10.1002/nla.622.
- [9] Peter Benner and Jens Saak. Linear-Quadratic Regulator Design for Optimal Cooling of Steel Profiles. Technical Report SFB393/05-05, Sonderforschungsbereich 393 *Parallele Numerische Simulation für Physik und Kontinuumsmechanik*, TU Chemnitz, D-09107 Chemnitz (Germany), 2005. URL: <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:swb:ch1-200601597>.
- [10] Rajendra Bhatia. *Matrix analysis*, volume 169 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer Science & Business Media, New York, NY, 2013. doi:10.1007/978-1-4612-0653-8.
- [11] Rajendra Bhatia and John A. R. Holbrook. Unitary invariance and spectral variation. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 95:43–68, 1987. doi:10.1016/0024-3795(87)90026-7.
- [12] D. A. Bini, B. Iannazzo, and B. Meini. *Numerical solution of algebraic Riccati equations*, volume 9 of *Fundamentals of Algorithms*. SIAM Publications, Philadelphia, 2012. doi:10.1137/1.9781611972092.
- [13] Matthias Bollhöfer and André K. Eppler. A structure preserving FGMRES method for solving large Lyapunov equations. In Michael Günther, Andreas Bartel, Markus Brunk, Sebastian Schöps, and Michael Striebel, editors, *Progress in Industrial Mathematics at ECMI 2010*, Mathematics in Industry, pages 131–136. Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2012. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-25100-9_15.
- [14] R. P. Eddy. Extrapolating to the limit of a vector sequence. In *Information linkage between applied mathematics and industry*, pages 387–396. Academic Press, Cambridge, MA, 1979. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-734250-4.50028-X.
- [15] Stanley C. Eisenstat, Howard C. Elman, and Martin H. Schultz. Variational iterative methods for nonsymmetric systems of linear equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 20(2):345–357, 1983. doi:10.1137/0720023.
- [16] Rola El-Moallem and Hassane Sadok. Vector extrapolation applied to algebraic Riccati equations arising in transport theory. *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.*, 40:489–506, 2013. URL: <https://etna.math.kent.edu/vol.40.2013/pp489-506.dir/pp489-506.pdf>.
- [17] Gene H. Golub and Charles F. Van Loan. *Matrix computations*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2013. doi:10.56021/9781421407944.
- [18] Wolfgang Hackbusch. *Iterative Solution of Large Sparse Systems of Equations*, volume 95 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2016. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-28483-5.
- [19] Nicholas J. Higham. *Accuracy and stability of numerical algorithms*. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2002. doi:10.1137/1.9780898718027.
- [20] Roger A. Horn and Charles R. Johnson. *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge university press, Cambridge, 2012. doi:10.1017/CB09781139020411.
- [21] Marc Jungers. Historical perspectives of the Riccati equations. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 50(1):9535–9546, 2017. doi:10.1016/j.ifacol.2017.08.1619.
- [22] S. Kaniel and J. Stein. Least-square acceleration of iterative methods for linear equations. *J. Opt. Th. Appl.*, 14:431–437, 1974. doi:10.1007/BF00933309.
- [23] Daniel Kressner, Stefano Masei, and Leonardo Robol. Low-rank updates and a divide-and-conquer method for linear matrix equations. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 41(2):A848–A876, 2019. doi:10.1137/17M1161038.

-
- [24] Peter Lancaster and Leiba Rodman. *Algebraic Riccati equations*. Oxford Science Publications. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1995. doi:[10.1093/oso/9780198537953.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198537953.001.0001).
- [25] Jing-Rebecca Li and Jacob White. Low rank solution of Lyapunov equations. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 24(1):260–280, 2002. doi:[10.1137/S0895479801384937](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0895479801384937).
- [26] Yiding Lin and Valeria Simoncini. A new subspace iteration method for the algebraic Riccati equation. *Numer. Lin. Alg. Appl.*, 22(1):26–47, 2015. doi:[10.1002/nla.1936](https://doi.org/10.1002/nla.1936).
- [27] Arash Massoudi, Mark R. Opmeer, and Timo Reis. Analysis of an iteration method for the algebraic Riccati equation. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 37(2):624–648, 2016. doi:[10.1137/140985792](https://doi.org/10.1137/140985792).
- [28] Marián Mešina. Convergence acceleration for the iterative solution of the equations $X = AX + f$. *Comp. Meth. Appl. Mech. Eng.*, 10(2):165–173, 1977. doi:[10.1016/0045-7825\(77\)90004-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0045-7825(77)90004-4).
- [29] Christian Moosmann, Evgenii B. Rudnyi, Andreas Greiner, and Jan G. Korvink. Model order reduction for linear convective thermal flow. In *Proceedings of 10th International Workshops on THERMal INvestigations of ICs and Systems*, 2004. URL: <http://modelreduction.rudnyi.ru/doc/papers/moosmann04THERMINIC.pdf>.
- [30] Oberwolfach Benchmark Collection. Steel profile. hosted at MOR Wiki – Model Order Reduction Wiki, 2005. URL: http://modelreduction.org/index.php/Steel_Profile.
- [31] Davide Palitta and Patrick Kürschner. On the convergence of low-rank Krylov methods. *Numer. Algorithms*, 88(3):1383–1417, 2021. doi:[10.1007/s11075-021-01080-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11075-021-01080-2).
- [32] Thilo Penzl. A cyclic low-rank Smith method for large sparse Lyapunov equations. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 21(4):1401–1418, 1999. doi:[10.1137/S1064827598347666](https://doi.org/10.1137/S1064827598347666).
- [33] Péter Pulay. Convergence acceleration of iterative sequences. the case of SCF iteration. *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, 73(2):393–398, 1980. doi:[10.1016/0009-2614\(80\)80396-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0009-2614(80)80396-4).
- [34] Péter Pulay. Improved SCF convergence acceleration. *J. Comput. Chem.*, 3(4):556–560, 1982. doi:[10.1002/jcc.540030413](https://doi.org/10.1002/jcc.540030413).
- [35] Youcef Saad. A flexible inner-outer preconditioned GMRES algorithm. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 14(2):461–469, 1993. doi:[10.1137/0914028](https://doi.org/10.1137/0914028).
- [36] Youcef Saad and Martin H. Schultz. GMRES: A generalized minimal residual algorithm for solving nonsymmetric linear systems. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 7(3):856–869, 1986. doi:[10.1137/0907058](https://doi.org/10.1137/0907058).
- [37] Jens Saak, Martin Köhler, and Peter Benner. M-M.E.S.S.-3.0 – the matrix equations sparse solvers library, August 2023. doi:[10.5281/zenodo.7701424](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7701424).
- [38] Jonas Schulze and Jens Saak. An extension of the low-rank Lyapunov ADI to non-zero initial values and its applications. e-print 2406.13477, arXiv, 2024. math.NA. doi:[10.48550/arXiv.2406.13477](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.13477).
- [39] Ron Shepard and Michael Minkoff. Some comments on the DIIS method. *Mol. Phys.*, 105(19-22):2839–2848, 2007. doi:[10.1080/00268970701691611](https://doi.org/10.1080/00268970701691611).
- [40] Avram Sidi. Extrapolation vs. projection methods for linear systems of equations. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 22(1):71–88, 1988. doi:[10.1016/0377-0427\(88\)90289-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-0427(88)90289-0).
- [41] Avram Sidi. Efficient implementation of minimal polynomial and reduced rank extrapolation methods. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 36(3):305–337, 1991. doi:[10.1016/0377-0427\(91\)90013-A](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-0427(91)90013-A).

-
- [42] Avram Sidi. *Practical extrapolation methods: Theory and applications*, volume 10. Cambridge university press, Cambridge, 2003. doi:[10.1017/CB09780511546815](https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511546815).
- [43] Avram Sidi. A convergence study for reduced rank extrapolation on nonlinear systems. *Numer. Algorithms*, 84:957–982, 2020. doi:[10.1007/s11075-019-00788-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11075-019-00788-6).
- [44] Avram Sidi and Yair Shapira. Upper bounds for convergence rates of acceleration methods with initial iterations. *Numer. Algorithms*, 18(2):113–132, 1998. doi:[10.1023/A:1019113314010](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1019113314010).
- [45] Valeria Simoncini. Analysis of the rational Krylov subspace projection method for large-scale algebraic Riccati equations. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 37(4):1655–1674, 2016. doi:[10.1137/16M1059382](https://doi.org/10.1137/16M1059382).
- [46] Valeria Simoncini. Computational Methods for Linear Matrix Equations. *SIAM Rev.*, 58(3):377–441, 2016. doi:[10.1137/130912839](https://doi.org/10.1137/130912839).
- [47] Valeria Simoncini and Yue Hao. Analysis of the truncated conjugate gradient method for linear matrix equations. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 44(1):359–381, 2023. doi:[10.1137/22M147880X](https://doi.org/10.1137/22M147880X).
- [48] The MOR Wiki Community. Convective thermal flow. MOR Wiki – Model Order Reduction Wiki, 2018. URL: <http://modelreduction.org/index.php/Convection>.
- [49] Ninoslav Truhar and Krešimir Veselić. An efficient method for estimating the optimal dampers’ viscosity for linear vibrating systems using Lyapunov equation. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 31(1):18–39, 2009. doi:[10.1137/070683052](https://doi.org/10.1137/070683052).
- [50] Thomas Wolf and Heiko K. F. Panzer. The ADI iteration for Lyapunov equations implicitly performs \mathcal{H}_2 pseudo-optimal model order reduction. *International Journal of Control*, 89(3):481–493, 2016. doi:[10.1080/00207179.2015.1081985](https://doi.org/10.1080/00207179.2015.1081985).
- [51] David M. Young and Kang C. Jea. Generalized conjugate-gradient acceleration of nonsymmetrizable iterative methods. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 34:159–194, 1980. doi:[10.1016/0024-3795\(80\)90165-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3795(80)90165-2).